Case 1:17-cv-04936-JLC Document 140 Filed 07/08/19 Page 1 of 205

J5mdtap1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK -----x 2 3 VICTOR TAPIA, Plaintiff, 4 New York, N.Y. 5 17 Civ. 4936 (JLC) V. SPACE NY 50th ST LLC, EDEN 6 BALLROOM LLC, ANTONIO 7 PIACQUADIO, CARLO SENECA and MICHAEL GENITON, 8 Defendants. 9 10 May 22, 2019 9:50 a.m. 11 12 Before: 13 HON. JAMES L. COTT, 14 Magistrate Judge 15 **APPEARANCES** 16 CONNOLLY LAW Attorneys for Plaintiff 17 BY: KERRY E. CONNOLLY 18 AKERMAN LLP Attorneys for Defendants 19 BY: VINCENT AVERY MELISSA OVERBECK 20 21 - also present -22 Victor Tapia Antonio Piacquadio Michael Geniton 23 24 Karin Figueroa, Spanish Language Interpreter 25

1	THE CLERK: Tapia versus Space New York 50th Street.
2	Counsel, state your name for the record.
3	MS. CONNOLLY: Good morning, your Honor. Kerry
4	Connolly, from Connolly Law, for the plaintiff, Victor Tapia.
5	THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Connolly. Good morning,
6	Mr. Tapia.
7	MR. AVERY: Good morning, your Honor. Vincent Avery
8	and Melissa Overbeck for the defendants.
9	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Avery. Good morning,
10	Ms. Overbeck.
11	Do you want to introduce your clients?
12	MR. AVERY: This Anthony Piacquadio and Michael
13	Geniton.
14	THE COURT: You may be seated.
15	Good morning, gentlemen.
16	OK. A few preliminary matters before we get started
17	with Mr. Tapia's trial. First of all, I wanted to apologize to
18	counsel and your clients for having to cancel at the last
19	minute last month. I feel very badly about it. I just was not
20	able to make it into court that day.
21	Ms. Connolly, my deputy tells me that you may have
22	incurred an interpreter expense as a result of that. Is that
23	true?
24	MS. CONNOLLY: We are working it out, your Honor.
25	THE COURT: OK. If you don't work it out for some

reason, let me know. I don't know that there is anything I can do, but there are things I could look into. There is a bench and bar fund in the court, etc. So, if there is an issue, I want you to tell me because you are not responsible for it, I am, so --

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, judges are human and I am working that out.

THE COURT: So if there is an issue, I just want to let you know. I am happy to help, if I can.

MS. CONNOLLY: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The second issue is we have the letter THE COURT: about Mr. Soto's settlement that was sent on May 5th and then the defendants' response. I quess my question is, at lease in my reading of the settlement agreement that exists, if there is a breach, what it says is that the confessions of judgment will be held in escrow by plaintiff Soto's counsel and will not be entered, ever filed at any time other than in the event that the defendants fail to make any of the installment payments as set forth above, i.e., one of the postdated checks fails to clear Soto's counsel's escrow account, or defendants fail to deliver the payments to plaintiff Soto's counsel within ten days of the Court approving the agreement. In the event defendants breach this settlement agreement by failing to make timely payment, the entire settlement amount shall automatically be accelerated and plaintiff shall be allowed to

file the confessions of judgment, less payments already made, together with all costs and attorney's fees incurred by plaintiff in connection with any efforts to enforce the confessed judgments.

So, isn't that what should happen next if there has in fact been a breach, which doesn't seem to be contested?

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, I don't have the original confessions of judgment. I don't even know why we are having, you know, this dispute, because has it ever been that a plaintiff in a settlement doesn't get an original copy of the settlement agreement and confessions of judgment?

THE COURT: Well, that should be easy to solve.

Mr. Avery, if you have these original confessions, why haven't they been provided to Ms. Connolly?

MR. AVERY: It is not about -- two things. One, your Honor, I'm not really sure, unless I am mistaken, if in the event, since I believe your Honor is retaining jurisdiction over the settlement, in the settlement agreement itself, that when she would be filing a confession, she would be sending it to the judgment clerk, and I'm not understanding what the original is. They had scanned and emailed them to me. I emailed them to her. They are actually color copies with blue ink. We not contesting the authenticity.

THE COURT: Let me interrupt you to say -- intervene to say one thing. I don't think I have retained jurisdiction,

```
necessarily. There is no provision that I saw in this agreement that had this Court retain jurisdiction, unless I missed it. So, you say that but is there a provision to that effect? Because it is not in the agreement that I reviewed yesterday. Did I miss it?
```

MR. AVERY: Your Honor, it's possible I am mistaken; I don't have the agreement in front of me right now. And to the extent -- and I will say this: To the extent that the confessions are not -- it is opposing counsel's intention to, I guess, file it in state court, then we can provide originals. Again, in fact, the defendants are here. If you have a blank copy, Kerry, we can just sign it now. It really just was a logistics issue. I didn't have the originals to give, and I honestly thought that your Honor had retained jurisdiction pursuant to --

THE COURT: During our recess today, why don't you all have a further discussion about this.

I gather the breach is uncontested; is that correct?

MR. AVERY: That is correct.

THE COURT: Had there been any payments made to Mr. Soto?

MR. AVERY: No.

THE COURT: All right. So, Ms. Connolly, assuming you had the originals, what would your intention be with respect to them?

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, I would seek to enforce them. I would seek to file them in the relevant state court jurisdictions.

THE COURT: Right, because I don't think there is any retention in this court over this matter.

MS. CONNOLLY: Right.

THE COURT: So you need them to file them in whatever state court you are going to file them in.

MS. CONNOLLY: Right.

THE COURT: OK. But your view is that the confessions of judgment you have would not be accepted by the state court because they are considered copies and not originals?

MS. CONNOLLY: That is right, your Honor, not in all jurisdictions. In some jurisdictions you file them electronically and others still do not have electronic filing, you have to actually walk them in and the clerk insists upon the original.

THE COURT: I can't recall whether the confessions themselves are exhibits to what was on the docket but --

MS. CONNOLLY: They were supposed to have been, not in the form attached hereto, but when defendants filed the stipulation of settlement, the executed copy, they did not attach the confessions of judgment.

THE COURT: All right. Well, do you happen to have so-called copies of them with you?

1 MS. CONNOLLY: No. THE COURT: How about the defense table, do you happen 2 3 to have them with you? 4 MR. AVERY: Not hard copies. She has her email and we 5 could show the Court the email and print it out. 6 THE COURT: Maybe you could email it to my 7 chambers' --8 MR. AVERY: OK. 9 THE COURT: -- mailbox and during a recess we could 10 print it out and then the individual defendants could sign 11 them, and then you will have them in hand signed. How about 12 that? 13 MS. CONNOLLY: They also have to be notarized. 14 THE COURT: My deputy is a notary, so we could do 15 that. So, why don't we try and tend to those ministerial 16 17 matters either at the recess or at the lunch break or at the 18 end of the day, or something along those lines. But does that -- if we accomplish that, Ms. Connolly, is that what you 19 20 need as far as that's concerned and nothing beyond that? 21 MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: OK. So I think we can accomplish that, 23 and we'll figure out how to make that happen before you all

All right. Does anybody else have any other

24

25

leave today.

preliminary matters to raise before we get started with 1 2 Mr. Tapia's trial? 3 MS. CONNOLLY: No, your Honor. I am going to forgo 4 any kind of opening because Mr. Soto is here and he would like to get to work. 5 6 THE COURT: OK. So he is going to be called to 7 testify first? 8 MS. CONNOLLY: Yes. 9 THE COURT: And, Mr. Avery, you are willing to forgo 10 openings as well? 11 MR. AVERY: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: 12 If there is a need for closings, I am more 13 than happy to have them. That is probably more useful, anyway, 14 since I think we are all generally familiar with the contours 15 of the case. So with that in mind, we will proceed, and, Ms. 16 17 Connolly, you can call your first witness. 18 MS. CONNOLLY: Thank you, your Honor. 19 Mr. Soto, take the stand, please. 20 THE COURT: Does he need an interpreter? 21 MS. CONNOLLY: 22 SAUL SOTO, 23 called as a witness by the plaintiff, 24 having been duly sworn, testified as follows: 25 THE CLERK: Please state your full name and spell your

Case 1:17-cv-04936-JLC Document 140 Filed 07/08/19 Page 9 of 205

J5mdtap1 Soto - direct

1 | full name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Saul Soto, S-a-u-l S-o-t-o.

3 THE CLERK: Please have a seat.

4 THE COURT: You may proceed, Ms. Connolly.

MS. CONNOLLY: Thank you.

6 DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. CONNOLLY:

5

7

8

9

11

Q. Good morning, Mr. Soto.

Could you please explain to us how you came to be

10 | involved in this case?

- A. Because I used to work with Mr. Tapia together.
- 12 | Q. And where were you employed?
- 13 A. Space nightclub.
- 14 | Q. And who was your employer?
- 15 A. Mr. Antonio and the other gentleman.
- 16 Q. Are you referring to the gentlemen sitting at defense
- 17 | table?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 | Q. And is that the gentleman to your left of Ms. Overbeck?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. Is that the same Antonio, and his last name?
- 22 | A. I can't --
- 23 | Q. Is it Piacquadio?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. Do you know who the gentleman is sitting next to him?

J5mdtap1

Α. Yes.

- Who do you understand him to be? 2 Q.
- 3 The owner of the nightclub. Α.
- 4 And we are talking about the man sitting next to Mr. Q.
- 5 Piacquadio?
- 6 Both. Α.
- 7 Q. Both?
- 8 Α. Yes.
- 9 Both gentlemen are owners of the nightclub, is that right? Q.
- 10 Α. Yes.
- 11 And you are not remembering the name of the man to the
- 12 right of Mr. Piacquadio?
- 13 Sorry. Mike. I don't know the last name. Α.
- 14 Q. Do you know what the roles of Antonio Piacquadio and Mike
- 15 were at Space?
- 16 Director or manager and owners.
- 17 And what did they do -- what did you see them doing at
- 18 Space?
- I mean, how do I say, trying to -- to make a good business. 19
- 20 OK. Did you -- what did they do -- were they there every
- 21 day that you worked?
- 22 Like, I don't really understand that.
- 23 Did you see Mr. Piacquadio and Mike at Space every day you
- 24 worked at Space?
- 25 Yeah, they were there. Α.

- And how were you paid for your work at Space? 1 Q. OK.
- 2 Objection. Relevance. MR. AVERY:
- 3 THE COURT: I will allow it. Overruled.
- 4 You can answer the question. How were you paid?
- THE WITNESS: Cash, sometimes checks, but the check 5
- would bounce. 6
- 7 BY MS. CONNOLLY:
- And what would you do with the check or checks that 8
- 9 bounced?
- 10 Α. Give it back to them.
- 11 And were Mr. Piacquadio or Mike involved in paying you?
- 12 Yes, but usually the manager is who gives the money.
- 13 And did there come a time when you became involved in this Ο.
- 14 lawsuit?
- 15 Α. Yep.
- 16 Ο. And why was that?
- 17 Because they owe me money.
- 18 MR. AVERY: Objection. Relevance.
- THE COURT: I will allow it. 19
- 20 Q. And did you communicate your -- the fact that they owed you
- 21 money to Mr. Piacquadio and Mike?
- 22 Α. Yes.
- 23 MR. AVERY: Objection.
- 24 And how did you do that? And what happened when you did
- 25 that?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

A. I mean, they always tell me, like, OK, next week, next two weeks. Then after they would tell me like next week and it never happened.

MR. AVERY: Your Honor, I am going to object on both what appears to be sort of character-based evidence and relevance.

THE COURT: What do you mean by character-based evidence?

MR. AVERY: If she is offering this testimony to establish some sort of pattern or habit of nonpayment based on one individual as to another, I mean, this is not his trial.

THE COURT: No. But you're going to offer evidence about when he did work, and you're going to offer it in the same regard for pattern evidence, because he could use a clock and Mr. Tapia could use a clock, so there is that. And there is also the issue of whether he is biased or not, which goes to his credibility. So, I think this is all admissible evidence for both of those reasons.

So, overruled.

BY MS. CONNOLLY:

- Q. And who did you communicate with, besides the managers, about the money that was owed to you?
- 23 | A. Them.
- 24 | 0. Who is "them"?
- 25 A. The owners. I'm sorry.

- And do you recall how you did that?
- By emails, text message, verbally. Α.
- 3 THE COURT: By email, text messages, and what was the
- 4 last thing you said?
- 5 THE WITNESS: Talking.
- 6 THE COURT: Conversations?
- 7 THE WITNESS: Conversations. I'm sorry.
- BY MS. CONNOLLY: 8
- 9 And what were those conversations?
- 10 I mean, like I would tell them like they owe me money and I
- 11 need it. Because there was times I used to work like a lot, a
- 12 lot of hours, and that was my only job and I didn't have any
- 13 money to pay my rent, and I had to chase them for money.
- 14 That's not right.
- Q. Of the owners that are here, do you know if either -- who 15
- was responsible for, if either of them, for collecting cash at 16
- 17 the end of the night?
- 18 MR. AVERY: Objection. Relevance.
- 19 Α. The manager --
- 20 THE COURT: Just one second. Don't answer until I
- 21 rule.
- 22 Yes. Sustained.
- 23 Do you know whether Mr. Piacquadio and Mike hire and fire
- 24 people?
- 25 It was mostly the manager, the manager used to hire people.

- 1 Did you ever witness either Mr. Piacquadio or Mr. Geniton
- 2 hiring or firing someone?
- 3 Me? Α.
- 4 Q. OK.
- 5 THE COURT: Just to be precise about that, are you 6 saying that one of those gentlemen fired you?
- 7 THE WITNESS: I mean, they told the bouncer to kick me 8 out.
- 9 THE COURT: They told a bouncer to kick you out?
- 10 THE WITNESS: Yeah, out of the building.
- 11 BY MS. CONNOLLY:
- 12 How did that come about? How did that incident come about?
 - I'm sorry? Α.
- 14 How did that happen? What happened that the bouncer would
- kick you out? 15

- 16 Aggressively. Α.
- 17 What led up to that? Why did that happen? Ο.
- 18 Oh, because there was this old gentleman. They used to owe
- 19 him \$500, to the old guy, very old guy and hard working.
- 20 he's alone in this country. So I came up to the office to talk
- 21 to them, try to talk to them, trying to get his money so he
- 22 could get paid. But they were like, oh, we can't pay him right
- 23 now. And I was like, but you can pay him, like it's \$500.
- 24 are making a lot money right now, so why don't you pay him, you
- 25 He is an old guy. He needs to pay his rent. know.

2

3

4

And then the manager came up to me, like, kind of like aggressively, and said, Saul, you're not supposed to do this.

Like, it's not even your money. I'm like, yeah, but they owe me money, too. So, no, I can pay him out of my pocket and then I can get the money back from them. And then at the end they

5

pay him, right, they paid the guy, the man. But after that they told me you have to go.

7

8

THE COURT: Who told you you have to go?

9

THE WITNESS: The security.

10

THE COURT: Why?

11

THE WITNESS: The security left. I don't know why.

12

They told me I had to go.

13

But I never did anything wrong. I'm just trying to

14

get the money, you know.

15

THE COURT: All right. Next question, Ms. Connolly.

16

BY MS. CONNOLLY:

happened?

17

Q. Do you know if your time was recorded in any way for the

18

19

A. The computer, clock in.

work you did at Space?

20

Q. OK. Can you explain how that clocking in and clocking out

21

22

A. We used to clock into the computer.

23

Q. Did you clock in every day that you worked?

24

A. Yes. Sometimes in the morning, sometimes not, but because

25

there was different positions. But sometimes the clock -- the

J5mdtap1

- computer didn't work.
- 2 And did that happen often? Q.
- 3 Yeah. Yeah, sometimes. Α.
- 4 So --Q.

- For some reason, it didn't work. 5
- 6 So if you were shown a copy of your time records from 0. OK.
- 7 the computer, you wouldn't be able to say whether or not they
- 8 were accurate, would you?
- 9 I wouldn't be able to. Α.
- 10 And what would happen if you were not allowed to clock in
- 11 for some reason?
- 12 Oh, we used to sign a sheet -- we used to sign a sheet to
- 13 clock in and out.
- 14 OK. Who maintained that sheet? Q.
- Jennifer. She used to work there. 15 Α.
- 16 Is Jennifer an Asian lady? 0.
- 17 Α. Yes.
- 18 MS. CONNOLLY: We finally have the identity of the
- 19 Asian lady. OK.
- 20 Q. Now, do you know whether everyone -- do you know whether
- 21 everyone at Space clocked in and out?
- 22 Α. I'm not sure.
- 23 Did everyone at Space have an employee number, to your
- 24 knowledge?
- 25 They're supposed to. I think they are supposed to, but I'm

- not sure if everyone had a number.
- And do you know what happened to that sheet, or what was 2 Q.
- 3 done with that sheet where you would write down your hours when
- 4 you were not able to clock in and out?
- 5 I don't know what happened.
- 6 Do you know whether or not the time clock computer was able 0.
- 7 to be accessed by managers at Space?
 - Α. I'm sorry. Say that again.
- 9 Were managers able to access the computer where you were
- 10 supposed to punch in and out?
- 11 Α. Yeah.
- 12 Do you know whether or not the managers and anybody with
- 13 access to the computer would be able to change your hours?
- 14 MR. AVERY: Objection, your Honor. Leading.
- Α. I'm sure --15
- 16 THE COURT: One second.
- 17 THE WITNESS: Sorry.
- 18 THE COURT: Just so you understand, if Mr. Avery
- objects, I have to decide whether the question can be answered 19
- 20 So, I need to look at the question again. or not.
- 21 (Pause)
- 22 The objection is overruled.
- 23 You can answer the question. The question was do you
- 24 know whether or not the managers or anybody with access to the
- 25 computer would be able to change your hours? Do you know one

J5mdtap1 Soto - direct

1 | way or the other?

2 THE WITNESS: Yes.

3 THE COURT: OK.

4 THE WITNESS: I know they were able to change the

5 hours.

6

7

8

THE COURT: Say that again.

THE WITNESS: I know they were able to change the

hours.

9 BY MS. CONNOLLY:

- 10 | Q. What was your position or positions at Space?
- 11 A. I started as a porter and then became busboy, barback, and
- 12 then, like, trying to maintain like the club, like little
- 13 construction.
- 14 | Q. When you worked as a porter, what were your hours?
- 15 A. Eight -- eight hours during the day and then after at
- 16 | night.
- 17 | Q. So eight hours during the day, but approximately what time
- 18 | would you begin and what time would you end?
- 19 | A. Sometimes 12 to 8.
- 20 | Q. 12 p.m. to 8 p.m.?
- 21 | A. Sometimes 1 p.m. to 9.
- 22 | Q. That's 1 p.m. to 9 p.m.?
- 23 A. Sometimes there were, like, early events; I used to be
- 24 | there earlier.
- 25 | Q. And when you worked as a busboy and barback, what did those

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

22

two jobs involve?

- I was supposed to get tips and the minimum wage. Well, I 2 3 never got the minimum wage.
 - Q. What were your duties and responsibilities during those two positions?

Objection. Relevance. MR. AVERY:

THE COURT: I don't want you to belabor this very long but I will allow that question.

What were your duties and responsibilities?

THE WITNESS: Hospitality, maintain -- try to keep the guests happy and keep them -- like, the table clean and, you know, trying to be -- how do I say it, try to be -- I don't know how to say it.

THE COURT: Next question, please.

BY MS. CONNOLLY: 15

- Q. Approximately how many times did you get paid by a check that bounced?
- 18 Probably it was like maybe five times.
- 19 And what kind of documentation, if any, did you receive 20 when you got paid?
- 21 Well, there is a sheet that we used to sign if we get paid. Α.
 - And were you given any documents at that time?
- 23 If I sign any document? Α.
- 24 When you got paid and you signed a document, were you given 25 a copy of the document at that time?

- No, never. I never got a copy. Α.
- 2 MS. CONNOLLY: OK. I have no more questions,
- 3 Mr. Soto. Thank you.
- 4 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Connolly.
- 5 Mr. Avery gets to ask you questions now. You might not like this as much. 6
- 7 MR. AVERY: I will be nice.
- 8 Your Honor, permission to approach the witness?
- 9 THE COURT: Yes.
- 10 MR. AVERY: For the record, I am showing the witness 11 what's been premarked as Defense Exhibit D.
- 12 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 13 BY MR. AVERY:

20

- 14 Q. Mr. Soto, there is testimony --
- 15 MS. CONNOLLY: Excuse me, your Honor. I have an objection to this document. At Mr. Tapia's deposition, I 16 17 pointed out that the copy he showed Mr. Tapia like this, these are not -- this is not one document. This is -- one is titled 18 "Earnings Record," and the other thing purports to be, you 19
- 21 MR. AVERY: That's fine, your Honor. We can make it 22 D1 and D2, if that is preferable.
- 23 THE COURT: That is preferable.

know, the punch-in, punch-out records.

24 OK. So let's make D1 is the top page. MR. AVERY: D2 25 is the punch-in and punch-out records that follow.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

THE COURT: 1 OK.

So flipping to D2, that's what I want to MR. AVERY: focus on for a moment.

THE COURT: That's the second page.

BY MR. AVERY:

Q. You testified on direct that you would punch in and punch out.

THE COURT: I'm sorry to interrupt you, Mr. Avery, as you are starting, but one thing I don't like is lawyers saying what someone said in their testimony. Just ask the question. Don't summarize what you thought he already said.

MR. AVERY: Sure.

THE COURT: Just ask your question. OK. The record is whatever he said, not --

MR. AVERY: Sure.

16 BY MR. AVERY:

- You punched in at the start of your shifts, right?
- 18 Α. Yes.
- 19 And you did so using an employee code? Q.
- 20 Employee? Α.
- 21 Q. A code.
- 22 Yes. I mean, at the beginning we used to click into the
- 23 card.
- So initially there was a card? 24 Ο.
- 25 A card, a clock-in card. Α.

- 1 And at some point that switched to a system in which you 2 would enter a code, you said, into a computer?
 - Yes. Α.

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- And you did that at the start of the shifts, right? Q.
- 5 Α. Yes.
 - And you did that at the end of the shifts, right? 0.
 - Α. Yes.
 - And you indicate -- sorry. Q. OK.

As you sit here today, do you have any knowledge that a supervisor changed your time entries?

I don't -- I don't know if they changed, but I know they could have changed because they have access.

THE COURT: You don't know that they did change but you know they could change; is that what you are saying?

THE WITNESS: They could change, yes.

THE COURT: But you don't know if they ever did that in any of your records? Do you have any knowledge that any manager ever changed any of your hours in the computer?

THE WITNESS: I remember seeing Jennifer, the girl, she used to work there, she used to keep track of the sign-ins and sign-outs. She could do that.

THE COURT: I know she could do it. The question is did she do it with respect to your hours?

THE WITNESS: Not -- I don't think my hours.

THE COURT: OK.

BY MR. AVERY:

- Do you have any knowledge whether that would be indicated 2
- 3 on the timecard that's marked as D2 if a change did occur?
- I don't know. 4 Α.
- 5 So you don't know one way or another whether that would be
- recorded, is that right? 6
- 7 I mean, there is some hours that are not -- I don't
- 8 understand these hours. Sometimes it says one hour, two hours.
- 9 I don't -- I don't understand this.
- 10 Q. Do you want to -- when you say you don't understand it --
- 11 let me take a step back.
- 12 As you sit here today, do you have any basis to say
- 13 that the hours recorded on D2 are inaccurate for you?
- 14 A. They are inaccurate because I don't understand why I clock
- 15 in for two hours only.
- You are pointing to D2, for the record. 16
- 17 Is there a specific date you are referring to?
- 18 I mean, there is a lot of them. There is not specifically
- one that I want to refer, but there is a lot of them that is 19
- 20 not accurate.
- 21 Q. Let me ask you something.
- 22 Let's go to page -- what is indicated as page 9 of D2.
- 23 At the top it says page 9. This is actually the fourth page of
- 24 D2.
- 25 Are you there? Let me know when you are there are.

J5mdtap1 Soto - cross

THE COURT: Are you on page 9?

THE WITNESS: Page 9.

THE COURT: Yes, he is.

MR. AVERY: OK. Thank you.

- 5 BY MR. AVERY:
- Q. Do you see immediately at the top, the first entry is dated
- 7 | 8/5/2016, correct?
- 8 | A. Yes.

3

- 9 Q. And that entry is for 10 hours and 33 minutes, correct?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. And the next entry would be presumably the one you are
- 12 | referring to on 8/4, which is actually only for 18 minutes, is
- 13 | that right?
- 14 | A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. So you think that entry is wrong because it is 18 minutes,
- 16 || right?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 Q. OK. But can you look at the entry immediately below that?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 \parallel Q. That's also for 8/4, isn't it?
- 21 A. For seven hours.
- 22 | Q. Right. So you punched in twice on the same day?
- 23 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection. Mr. Avery just made a
- 24 | statement.
- 25 | THE COURT: Well, he is asking it as a question, I

J5mdtap1 Soto - cross

1 think.

2 MR. AVERY: Yes.

3 | THE COURT: So, overruled. I mean, let's rephrase it

- 4 as "isn't it correct."
- 5 BY MR. AVERY:
- 6 Q. Isn't it correct that you punched in on the same day twice?
- 7 A. Yeah, it is the same day.
- 8 Q. OK.
- 9 A. But I don't know what -- why I am going to clock in twice.
- 10 THE COURT: Next question. You can't just talk. He
- 11 has to ask you questions and then you've got to answer.
- 12 | Q. Isn't it true that you punched in on multiple days two
- 13 | times a day?
- 14 A. No, I don't recall that.
- 15 | Q. You don't recall punching in --
- 16 | A. No.
- 17 | Q. -- twice a day?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. Ever?
- 20 | A. No.
- 21 | Q. Never?
- 22 | A. (Shaking head)
- 23 | Q. Can you look down from where you just were one, two, three
- 24 entries.
- 25 A. OK.

J5mdtap1

1

- Are there two entries dated 7/30?
- I can't find it. Sorry. Α.
- MS. CONNOLLY: Objection, your Honor. The document 3
- 4 says what it says.
- THE COURT: Yes. I mean, we don't need to belabor 5 that. 6
- 7 MR. AVERY: I wasn't going to do it much longer.
- I don't know which one. Sorry. 8
- 9 MR. AVERY: OK. I will move on.
- 10 Did you ever give any employees your code? Q.
- 11 Α. Yes.
- 12 Q. Why?
- 13 Oh, if I had given it to my coworkers? Α.
- 14 Yes, your coworkers. Q.
- No. Of course not. Everybody has their own code, their 15 Α.
- 16 own number.
- 17 Q. Now, you said -- strike that.
- 18 Your shifts were 12 to 8 or 1 to 9, generally
- 19 speaking?
- 20 A. Because I used to work daytime and then after nighttime,
- 21 too.
- 22 Q. When you worked daytime and nighttime, was there a break in
- 23 between?
- 24 I just go straight. Α. No.
- 25 And the shift times at let's start with 12 to 8, were Q. OK.

those shifts that you would punch in a code on? 1

- 2 A. No, those are -- yeah, I was supposed to do it sometimes,
- 3 yeah. But sometimes on my shift the computer didn't work.
 - THE COURT: Next question.
- 5 MR. AVERY: Sure.
- How many times in, let's say, 2016 did the computer not 6
- 7 work?

- I'm not sure. 8 Α.
- 9 Would it be more or less than 10? Ο.
- 10 Probably more. Α.
- 11 Ο. More or less than 20?
- 12 Α. Between 20, something like that.
- 13 OK? Q.
- 14 THE COURT: I didn't understand that answer. You said
- 15 between 20?
- 16 THE WITNESS: I mean --
- 17 THE COURT: Between 10 and 20, is that what you meant?
- 18 THE WITNESS: Probably around 20. I'm sorry.
- THE COURT: Around 20? 19
- 20 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 21 THE COURT: Around 20 is his answer.
- 22 THE WITNESS: I'm not really sure.
- 23 THE COURT: He's not sure.
- 24 MR. AVERY: That's fine.
- 25 BY MR. AVERY:

J5mdtap1

Soto - cross

- And while we are on page 9 of D2 -- Exhibit D2, right --1 can you look at the entry dated 7/22/2016 for me? 2
- 3 (Pause)
- 4 OK. Α.
- 5 You punched in at 2:03 that day, correct? Yes?
- 6 It says here but I don't remember it. Α.
- 7 And you punched out at what would be 8:51, correct? Q.
- 8 Α. Correct. It says here in the paper.
- 9 OK. So the clock was working on that day, right? Q.
- 10 Α. Yeah.
- 11 Would it be safe to say that any date on which your hours
- 12 are represented on D2, the clock was working?
- 13 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection, your Honor.
- 14 THE COURT: I think I'm going to sustain that
- 15 objection.
- Next question. 16
- 17 BY MR. AVERY:
- 18 Q. Can you look at the entry number at 7/26/2016, the same
- 19 page.
- 20 (Pause)
- 21 Α. OK.
- 22 There are two entries. The first one you punched in at
- 23 10:14, correct?
- 24 Α. Correct.
- 25 And you punched out at 11 p.m., correct?

- Α. Correct.
- 2 Or 11 a.m. Sorry. Strike that. Q.
- 3 And then you punched back in later that same day, at
- 4 4:52, correct?
- 5 OK. Α.

- And you punched out at 5:21, correct? 6
- 7 Α. Correct.
 - And the clock was working on that day, correct? Q.
- 9 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection.
- 10 THE COURT: Sustained. The same question that I
- sustained the last time around. 11
- MR. AVERY: OK. 12
- 13 BY MR. AVERY:
- 14 Q. When the clock wasn't working, you indicated -- sorry.
- 15 Strike that.
- When the clock wasn't working, you would submit your 16
- 17 time manually on a signed piece of paper?
- 18 A. Yes. They had a sheet on the desk that we used to -- we
- 19 used to sign in.
- 20 And then those hours were entered into the system?
- 21 Jennifer, she was supposed to give it to the manager. Α.
- 22 Ο. And who was the manager?
- 23 It was Dave -- it was different managers.
- 24 OK. Can you flip to page 11 on your -- it is indicated as
- 25 page 11 on D2.

There is a column third from the left -- or third from

- the right, sorry, that says "Edited." Do you see that column?
- 3 Α. Yes.

1

- 4 And then there is a column right next to it that says Q.
- 5 "Edited By." Do you see that column?
- 6 Yes. Α.
- 7 Is there an indication that one of these entries on this
- 8 page was in fact edited?
- 9 I don't know. I don't recall that.
- 10 Do you see the name Morgan McLean? Ο.
- 11 Α. Yes.
- 12 Do you know why that's there?
- 13 He used to work there. Α.
- 14 Do you know one way or another why that name appears next
- 15 to that entry?
- 16 Probably he was the manager during the time.
- 17 MR. AVERY: And I believe I am almost finished, your
- 18 Honor.
- Q. Can you take a look through D2 real quick and tell me, are 19
- 20 there any other entries that have an indication with a name
- 21 that says "Edited By" and then a name in it?
- 22 I'm sorry. Which page?
- 23 The whole thing. Just flip through it.
- 24 Α. I'm sorry. What do you want me to do.
- 25 I want you to check if there is any other indication on D2,

Soto - cross

- where you said Morgan McLean was a supervisor, so a 1 2 supervisor's name in that column?
 - Α. Nope.

3

4

6

- MR. AVERY: If I could take one minute, your Honor?
- 5 THE COURT: You may.
 - (Pause)
- 7 MR. AVERY: Just a couple of more questions, your
- Honor. 8
 - Q. You indicated -- sorry. Strike that.
- 10 When you were advocating for that other employee 11 towards the end of your employment, there was a manager who 12 told you not to get involved, right?
- 13 I'm sorry, I don't really understand that. Α.
- 14 Q. When you were advocating for your coworker towards the end of your employment, there was another manager who told you not 15 16 to get involved?
- 17 THE COURT: Another manager from whom?
- MR. AVERY: From Eden Ballroom. 18
- 19 THE COURT: Someone who had nothing to do with Eden
- 20 Ballroom?
- 21 MR. AVERY: No. I can phrase it more directly, your
- 22 Honor.
- 23 Q. It wasn't Anthony or Mike Geniton who told you not to get
- 24 involved, was it?
- 25 It was Disco David. Α.

- Disco David, OK. Thank you. 1
- 2 Is that a nickname?
- 3 I don't know. He always said that was his name, Disco
- 4 David. I mean, everybody called him that.
- 5 Q. And when you were asked to leave the premise by the
- 6 bouncer, it was security who asked you to leave, right?
- 7 Α. Yes.
- It wasn't Anthony or Mike, was it? 8 Q.
- 9 No, but he said that Mike told him. Α.
- 10 The security guard --Q.
- 11 Α. Yes.
- 12 Q. -- told you Mike told him?
- 13 But Mike didn't tell you?
- 14 It was Mike. Α. No.
- Wait. Did you understand my question? 15 Q. OK.
- The security guard told you that it was Mike, correct? 16
- 17 Α. Yes.
- 18 But Mike didn't tell you that, didn't tell you to leave
- himself, did he? 19
- 20 He didn't tell me because I never get to see him. Α.
- 21 OK. You didn't see him at that time? Q.
- 22 He was in the office.
- 23 Ο. OK.
- 24 MR. AVERY: No further questions.
- 25 THE COURT: Any redirect?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes. Very short.

- REDIRECT EXAMINATION 2
- 3 BY MS. CONNOLLY:
- 4 Q. Mr. Soto, if you would take a look at Defendants' Exhibit
- 2. --5

- 6 THE COURT: Do you have a page? D2?
- 7 MS. CONNOLLY: D2, yes.
- Q. Page 7. Take a look at page 7, page 8, page 9, page 10, 8
- 9 page 11. Do you see your name anywhere on those pages?
- 10 Α. No.
- 11 Do you see your employee code anywhere on those pages?
- 12 Α. No.
- 13 And was it your practice to punch in and out ever for a Ο.
- 14 period of 18 minutes?
- 15 Α. No.
- So you have no idea whether or not this is your record of 16
- 17 time worked at Space, do you?
- A. Yeah. 18
- 19 THE COURT: I'm sorry. What was the answer to that
- 20 question?
- 21 THE WITNESS: Yes. I'm sorry.
- 22 THE COURT: Yes what?
- 23 THE WITNESS: I don't know if it's mine.
- 24 THE COURT: You don't know if it's yours?
- 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

J5mdtap1 Soto - recross

1 THE COURT: All right.

MS. CONNOLLY: Thank you, your Honor.

3 THE COURT: All right. Recross?

- 4 RECROSS-EXAMINATION
- 5 BY MR. AVERY:
- 6 Q. Can you look at page 6 of D2?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 | Q. Do you see your name on that page?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 Q. OK. And it has your employee number as 6005?
- 11 | A. It says here 005.
- 12 | Q. Was that your employee code?
- 13 | A. I don't remember.
- 14 Q. OK.
- 15 A. I mean, I've been working so many places, so many codes, I
- 16 | didn't keep track.
- 17 | Q. Can you look at page 6?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 Q. It's chronological, correct?
- 20 A. I don't understand.
- 21 | Q. The most recent date is on the top, correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 \mathbb{Q} . And the last day on page 6 is 11/29/2016, correct?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. And can you flip to page 7.

J5mdtap1

1 The top entry on page 7 is 11/28/2016, correct? 2 Α. Correct. 3 MR. AVERY: No further questions. 4 THE COURT: Anything further, Ms. Connolly? 5 MS. CONNOLLY: No, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Soto, you may step down. 7 THE WITNESS: Thank you. (Witness excused) 8 9 THE COURT: You may call your next witness. 10 MS. CONNOLLY: Mr. Victor Tapia, please take the 11 witness stand. 12 VICTOR TAPIA, 13 the plaintiff herein, having been duly sworn (through the 14 Interpreter), testified as follows: 15 THE CLERK: Please state your full name and spell your full name for the record. 16 17 THE WITNESS: Victor Tapia. 18 THE COURT: And just for the record, I gather, Madam 19 Interpreter, you are a certified interpreter? 20 THE INTERPRETER: Yes, I am. 21 THE COURT: All right. That is understood by counsel? 22 MS. CONNOLLY: Yes. 23 THE COURT: No issue with respect to the interpreter? 24 MR. AVERY: No issue, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: OK. You may proceed, Ms. Connolly.

- DIRECT EXAMINATION (through the Interpreter)
- BY MS. CONNOLLY: 2
- 3 Good morning, Mr. Tapia.
- Good morning. 4 Α.
- 5 Can you tell us how you got to be involved in this case? 0.
- Well, I -- the same thing, that they didn't pay me. 6 Α.
- 7 And who didn't pay you and what job are we talking about? Q.
- 8 Α. Well, I was working with them at the disco.
- 9 And when you say "them," to whom are you referring? Q.
- 10 Well, the owners from the disco. Α.
- 11 And are you referring to Mr. Piacquadio and the gentleman
- 12 who was identified as Mike at defense table?
- 13 Α. Yes.
- 14 Now, how did you come to get your job at Space?
- 15 Α. Through a friend, told me that they needed busboys.
- went to see the manager, and then, yes, he gave me the job. 16
- 17 OK. And who was it that you spoke to at Space? Ο.
- 18 I spoke to a lady who was the manager. I don't remember
- 19 her name.
- 20 Do you recall if this lady was an Asian lady? 0.
- 21 Yes. Α.
- 22 And what was that conversation that you had with her?
- 23 Well, I told her I was looking for a job, and she said,
- 24 yes, there they needed busboys. So we talked and she said,
- 25 When can you start? And then I said, Any day, there is no

- problem.
- What did you discuss about pay, if anything? 2
- 3 Well, we spoke that they were going to pay \$13 an hour plus
- 4 tips.

- Q. And what paperwork, if any, did you fill out during this 5
- 6 conversation with the Asian manager?
- 7 A. We just spoke and she told me that I was starting next
- Friday. And, no, I didn't fill out any papers. Then I worked 8
- 9 for close to two months and then was when she gave me papers.
- 10 So you didn't fill out any paperwork. And did you receive
- 11 any paperwork from this manager when you first met with her?
- 12 Α. No. We just spoke.
- 13 And how were you paid? 0.
- 14 They would just give me the tips. Α.
- 15 Q. And what paperwork, if any, did you receive when you were
- 16 paid your tips?
- 17 Α. None.
- 18 Can you tell us what your job was at Space?
- 19 Α. Busboy.
- 20 And what were your duties as a busboy at Space? 0.
- 21 Clean the tables, bring juices to the tables, help the
- 22 clients to see if they are OK with the service.
- 23 And did you have any responsibilities -- what
- 24 responsibilities did you have in terms of stocking the bars?
- 25 I didn't have any responsibility because they had a

J5mdtap1

- barback, but sometimes ourselves, we would help to serve 1
- 2 things.
- 3 Serve things. And would you --
- Not serve things. To tend to the bar, things like that. 4 Α.
- 5 When you say "tend to the bar," did that include 0.
- stocking items, moving boxes? 6
- 7 Α. Yes.
- And what items did you move around in boxes? 8 Q.
- 9 The alcohol boxes, water, Red Bulls, juices. Α.
- 10 Now, what was your schedule at Space? Q.
- 11 Α. I always worked from 8 to 7.
- 12 Q. And that's 8 p.m. to 7 a.m.?
- 13 Α. Yes.
- Did those hours vary? 14 Q.
- 15 Α. Yes, sometimes.
- And how would you know when you would come in or when to 16
- 17 leave?
- 18 Because one of the busboys was the one who tells.
- 19 I'm showing you what's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit Q.
- 20 1.
- 21 MR. AVERY: Your Honor, before there are questions on
- 22 this, we have an objection to this.
- 23 THE COURT: What is the objection?
- 24 MR. AVERY: This appears to be just counsel's
- 25 calculation of liability. It is not probative of anything.

MS. CONNOLLY: I would like to be able to ask the witness questions about it. If we can find out what it is, once I --

THE COURT: Well, it seems to me, Mr. Avery, you can cross-examine the witness about any and all of the information here. This is effectively an aid that I assume Ms. Connolly is going to say is going to memorialize what the witness is otherwise going to testify to, and then you can cross-examine him about that.

MR. AVERY: Just so I understand it, it's being used to essentially refresh his recollection?

THE COURT: I don't know what it is being used for because I haven't heard her ask any questions.

MR. AVERY: Fair enough.

THE COURT: We'll have to see what she's doing. And I'm not saying you can't object depending on what she is asking, but I am not going to sustain an objection to she can't use Exhibit 1 to ask any questions, which I think is what you have interposed for the moment. OK? So, that's overruled, but you can object to any question that you think is objectionable.

- Q. Mr. Tapia, do you recognize this document?
- 23 | A. Yes.

BY MS. CONNOLLY:

Q. Does it accurately reflect the dates of your employment, to the best of your knowledge?

- 1 Α. Yes.
- And does it accurately reflect the days per week you worked 2 Q.
- 3 and the hours you worked?
- 4 No. Α.
- 5 Ο. No?
- 6 Α. No.
- 7 In what way is it incorrect?
- It is incorrect because it doesn't show the three days that 8
- 9 I worked per week.
- 10 OK. So if you look at the second column, where it says
- "Days," and then below it, it says "P/W" -- no, the first page. 11
- 12 The second column, it says "Days," and then below it is "P/W."
- 13 Α. Yes.
- 14 And then below that, for each week it says "three."
- 15 Α. Yes.
- Now, do you know how this document was created? 16 OK. 0.
- 17 Α. No.
- Q. What kind of difficulties, if any, did you ever have in 18
- recording your time worked at Space? 19
- 20 MR. AVERY: Objection.
- 21 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 22 Rephrase the question.
- 23 BY MS. CONNOLLY:
- 24 Q. How did you notify management of the time you worked -- the
- 25 hours you worked at Space?

- Well, we -- sometimes the computer wouldn't work, it was 1
- locked, so we'd let them know. They'd always say they were 2
- 3 busy right now, put the dates, write the hours, and we're going
- 4 to correct it so that you have your hours correctly. At this
- 5 moment I can't do it.
- 6 Did you ever receive a copy of the hours that were recorded
- 7 for your work?
- 8 Α. No, never.
 - Ο. And --

- 10 THE COURT: I'm sorry to interrupt you, Ms. Connolly,
- but I think there is a certain foundation that hasn't entirely 11
- 12 been laid with respect to this subject with this witness in
- 13 terms of how his time was recorded. He just jumped in and
- 14 started talking about computers not working and the like, but
- you haven't really had him explain how his time was kept. So, 15
- I think you need to go back and do that for the record to be 16
- 17 clear.
- BY MS. CONNOLLY: 18
- 19 Mr. Tapia, was there a way you were told to record your
- 20 time that you worked at Space -- you were told by management?
- 21 Supposedly I had to work three days a week, and from there
- 22 they were going to check the hours, how many hours I worked per
- 23 day, but they never gave me any paper where I assured myself
- 24 that I was registered.
- 25 And how was it that you were supposed to record your OK.

to go back and see it.

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- time? Was there a time clock or some other method by which you were supposed to record your time?
- They would tell us and they had a schedule, but we would look like a week later, the following week, we wouldn't be able
- OK. And when you say you wouldn't be able to go back to 6 7 see it, you wouldn't be able to go back where to see it?
 - What happens is that they have that in their office.
 - And what is it -- what was that that you are talking about? Ο.
- 10 The schedule of the workers, which days that we were going 11 to work.
 - THE COURT: Let's try it this way, Ms. Connolly, if you don't mind.
 - Mr. Tapia, when you would arrive at work, whatever day and whatever time, what was the first thing you did when you arrived at work?
 - THE WITNESS: Oh, we would start to put the tables up, clean, organize, everything so that everything would be ready.
 - THE COURT: No, I don't mean the actual tasks. mean, what did you do to check in when you arrived at work, if anything?
 - THE WITNESS: Normally what we do is punch.
- 23 THE COURT: Normally what we do is?
- 24 THE WITNESS: Normally what we do is just punch.
- 25 THE COURT: Punch what?

1 THE WITNESS: Punch into the computer to work.

THE COURT: All right. When you say "normally," if

you didn't do that, would you do something else?

That's what we always did. THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: All right. Now, go from there.

BY MS. CONNOLLY:

- Were you able to punch in and out every day?
- 8 Α. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

- And can you explain why that was not possible? Ο.
- 10 Because the computer outside at the bar wasn't working,
- 11 wasn't turned on, and in the office the same, or they were
- 12 busy.
- 13 THE COURT: How many different places were there where
- 14 you could punch in when you arrived for work?
- 15 THE WITNESS: Just two places.
- THE COURT: One by the bar and one in the office? 16
- 17 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 18 THE COURT: And there were times when you would arrive
- 19 at work that both of those were not working?
- 20 THE WITNESS: The outside one was not working at the
- 21 bar, and the one in the office, I don't know because they
- 22 almost wouldn't allow me there in.
- 23 BY MS. CONNOLLY:
- 24 OK. Now, was the machine -- to your knowledge, was the
- 25 machine broken or was it just turned off?

- Sometimes it was off, sometimes it was on. When it was on, 1
- I would try to put my number in but it wouldn't allow me to. 2
- 3 And did you try to punch in every day from the first day
- you started work at Space? 4
- Yes, I tried to punch in. 5
- Did the manager, the Asian lady, did she give you an 6
- 7 employee code?
 - Yes, a number she gave me to punch in. Α.
- 9 And when did she give you that number? Ο.
- 10 She gave me after two months after I started working. Α.
- 11 So for the first two months when you started working, you
- 12 did not have an employee code?
- 13 Α. No.

- 14 So --Q.
- 15 THE COURT: Hold on. He said "no," which is not I
- 16 think what you asked him.
- 17 No, he didn't have an employee code, meaning he had
- 18 one? So, you need to make sure the record is clear.
- BY MS. CONNOLLY: 19
- 20 Q. Mr. Tapia, for the first two months you worked at Space,
- 21 did you have an employee code number?
- 22 I don't remember. I don't remember if she gave it to
- 23 me. Yes. I don't remember.
- 24 Mr. Tapia, do you remember testifying at your deposition
- 25 that you worked for several months and then you were given an

- Tapia direct
- 1 employee code and then an employee application?
- 2 Yes. Α.
- 3 So do you know whether or not you were able to punch OK.
- 4 in for the first couple of months you worked at Space?
- 5 Yes. Yes. Α.
- 6 Did you need an employee code to access the computer
- 7 to punch in?
- Yes, it was needed. 8 Α.
- 9 Now, how many times was the time clock not OK.
- 10 operational, not working? How many times per week? I'm sorry.
- 11 How many times per week?
- 12 Sometimes two days it wouldn't work.
- 13 And do you know why you --0. OK.
- 14 Α. No.
- 15 THE COURT: Hold on. Do you know why what?
- Do you know why you punched in and out, why you were 16
- 17 supposed to punch in and out?
- 18 Yes, to register the hours so they could pay me. Α.
- 19 And they never did pay you for those hours, correct? Q.
- 20 For the hours, never, just for the tips. Α.
- 21 And how were you paid for the tips? Q.
- 22 Α. Well, the tips were split through the night.
- 23 And were they paid to you --0. OK.
- 24 THE INTERPRETER: At the end of the night.
- 25 At the end of the night. Q.

1 And were they paid to you by check? By cash?

- Α. In cash.
- 3 And were you paid by any other method? 0. OK.
- 4 No. Α.

- 5 Were you ever paid by check?
- 6 Α. No.
- 7 Were you given pay statements each time you were paid the
- 8 tips?
- 9 Α. No.
- 10 At some point, you were paid some money that was owed to 11 you by the owners, correct?
- 12 MR. AVERY: Objection. Leading.
- 13 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 14 Please try not to lead.
- 15 MS. CONNOLLY: That is right.
- THE COURT: It is not that difficult. 16
- 17 BY MS. CONNOLLY:
- 18 Q. What monies that you say were owed were paid to you after this lawsuit was started, if any, by the defendants? 19
- 20 A. Well, they called me -- a friend of mine that worked there
- 21 called me that the owner wants to talk with me. So they were
- 22 calling, calling often. So then I went to the club and I
- 23 talked to the owner, and the owner gave me money. But I -- I
- 24 got it, but it's not the money that he -- it wasn't the money
- 25 that they owed me.

- It was only some of the money that they owed you; is that 1 2 what you mean?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 And the owner that you spoke with when you were paid that Q.
- 5 money, is that gentleman in this room?
- Yes. 6 Α.

- Can you point out the gentleman who paid you?
- It's the one that has the jacket with the white shirt. 8 Α.
 - The gentleman that Mr. Soto referred to as Mike, correct? Ο.
- 10 Α. Yes.
- 11 MS. CONNOLLY: I don't have any further questions.
- 12 Thank you, Mr. Tapia.
- 13 MR. AVERY: Can we just have one minute to get some
- 14 documents?
- THE COURT: Yes. 15
- 16 (Pause)
- 17 Anybody who wants to can stand up and stretch like I
- 18 am. A mini-recess without leaving the courtroom. We do this
- 19 in jury trials to keep jurors awake.
- 20 (Pause)
- 21 MS. CONNOLLY: Oh, can I move Plaintiff's Exhibit 1
- 22 into evidence?
- 23 THE COURT: Do you object to Exhibit 1 being in
- 24 evidence, Mr. Avery?
- 25 MR. AVERY: Yes, your Honor.

And the basis for the objection is? 1 THE COURT: 2 MR. AVERY: Because the extent to which it was used, 3 it was essentially just saying do you believe these numbers are correct. And he didn't know how it was created, even. 4 5 THE COURT: Well, here's the problem that I have, Ms. 6 Connolly. You just said "no further questions," and I don't 7 have in the record definitively what period of time Mr. Tapia says he worked, for example. This exhibit has weeks listed but 8 9 Mr. Tapia hasn't testified to that. In other words, leaving 10 Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 aside, which to my way of thinking memorializes what you've alleged in the complaint, he would 11 12 have to testify to all of that. And he's testified to I'll say 13 bits and pieces of what's on this piece of paper. He hasn't 14 testified to everything that is on this piece of paper. So, I don't see how this can be admitted as simply effectively an aid 15 to the Court memorializing what his testimony is because it 16 17 isn't entirely consistent with what his testimony is. 18 MS. CONNOLLY: Mr. Tapia said that it accurately reflected the dates of his employment. 19 20 THE COURT: Well, let me be clear with him about that. 21 So, Mr. Tapia, looking at Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 1, 22 this document says you began working at Space the week of 23 July 1st, 2016. Is that correct?

THE COURT: And this document says you continued

THE WITNESS: Yes.

24

working there until the week of January 6th, 2017. Is that 1 2 correct? 3 THE WITNESS: Yes. 4 THE COURT: And is it correct that on all of those 5 weeks you worked three days per week and 10 hours per day? 6 THE WITNESS: Yes. 7 THE COURT: So you worked 30 hours each of those weeks, no more and no less, is that correct? 8 9 THE WITNESS: Yes. 10 THE COURT: And you testified earlier that you were 11 told when you were hired you were going to be paid \$13 an hour 12 plus tips? 13 THE WITNESS: Yes, correct. 14 THE COURT: Your testimony is that you were not in 15 fact paid the \$13 per hour, you were just paid tips; is that 16 correct? 17 THE WITNESS: Yes. 18 THE COURT: And there is no written record of the 19 amount of money you were paid in tips, is that correct? 20 THE WITNESS: Yes. 21 THE COURT: You were never given any pieces of paper 22 of any kind from the defendants which indicated how much you 23 were being paid in tips or otherwise, is that right? 24 THE WITNESS: No. 25 THE COURT: That's not right?

THE WITNESS: Well, say that again. 1 THE COURT: Sure. Were you ever given any documents, 2 3 any pieces of paper, from your employer at Space that indicated or reflected how much you were being paid in tips each week? 4 5 THE WITNESS: No. 6 THE COURT: All right. Were you given any documents 7 when you began your employment at Space? 8 THE WITNESS: They gave me the -- yes. 9 THE COURT: What did they give you? 10 THE WITNESS: Just a form. THE COURT: What kind of form? 11 12 THE WITNESS: A form that was like with my name, 13 things like that. 14 THE COURT: Was it in English or Spanish? 15 THE WITNESS: In English. THE COURT: It was not in Spanish? 16 17 THE WITNESS: No. 18 THE COURT: All right. I would say, Mr. Avery, on the basis of the answers to these very specific questions that I've 19

THE COURT: All right. I would say, Mr. Avery, on the basis of the answers to these very specific questions that I've just asked that I would say filled in some gaps, that for the most part Plaintiff's 1 simply memorializes the testimony, and it's really almost the equivalent of what an attorney would submit on an inquest or in a post-trial submission, and so I will admit it -- I might not admit it if it were a jury trial because I think the way it was created would need to be further

20

21

22

23

24

developed -- but I think, Ms. Connolly, you prepared this
document, did you not?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, it's really an attorney document that memorializes testimony, and you are free to cross-examine him about any and all the information on it -- I'm sure you will -- and if you think there is something that you want to submit following the close of evidence related to anything here, I will certainly allow you to do that, if that is necessary.

I think there is authority -- we've done some research on this point -- that would allow an exhibit of this kind into evidence for what I'll call the limited purpose that I will consider it for, which is simply to memorialize what his testimony otherwise was. So, that's what it's being admitted for. But you are free to cross-examine about any of the specifics in it either by using the document or simply by asking questions related to the subject matter that's reflected in the document, like the dates or the number of hours, or anything else related to that is obviously fair game for you to cross-examine about. OK?

MR. AVERY: OK.

THE COURT: So, Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 is admitted for the limited purpose that I just said.

(Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 received in evidence)

MR. AVERY: OK. Thank you, your Honor.

1 THE COURT: You may proceed.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (through the Interpreter) 2

- BY MR. AVERY: 3
- 4 You believe your employment began July of 2016, correct?
- 5 Α. Yes.

6

7

9

And at the start of your employment, you did in fact receive paperwork, correct?

8 THE INTERPRETER: I didn't hear you.

- You did in fact receive paperwork, correct? Q.
- 10 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection.
- 11 Accuracy? Repeat the question.
- 12 At the start of your employment, you did in fact receive 13 paperwork, correct?
- 14 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection, your Honor.
- 15 THE COURT: Overruled or struck. I mean, it's
- 16 overruled. He did say that. Go ahead.
- 17 I thought he answered. Did he answer?
- 18 THE WITNESS: No.
- 19 THE COURT: You didn't receive paperwork? I thought
- 20 you just told me you received paperwork but it was in English
- 21 and not Spanish? Remember, you just answered my question about
- 22 that?
- 23 THE INTERPRETER: He is not listening to me. He's
- 24 listening to the English. Sorry.
- 25 Can you repeat the question, your Honor?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Let's start over.

Mr. Tapia, you have to listen to the interpreter. have an interpreter, so you are here to listen and answer in Spanish. Ignore the English.

All right. Go ahead, Mr. Avery. Let's start again.

BY MR. AVERY:

- Q. And at the start of your employment, you did in fact receive paperwork, correct?
- Α. Yes.
- And did that paperwork include your employee code?
- 11 Α. No.
- 12 At what point did you receive your employee code?
- 13 I missed -- like a month after I think she gave it to me. Α.

THE COURT: The "she" being the manager who has been described as an Asian woman; is that accurate?

THE WITNESS: Yes. Correct.

MR. AVERY: Permission to approach, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Pause)

MR. AVERY: I am going to take off the top page of A.

MS. CONNOLLY: What is it that you are showing him?

MR. AVERY: Defense Exhibit A.

(Counsel conferred)

MR. AVERY: This is what's been premarked as Defense Exhibit A. Based on the prior objection by plaintiff's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

counsel, I have removed the first page of that exhibit as we are not relying on it right new.

THE COURT: All right. So, are you referring to what says the word "Labor" at the top, and that is going to be called Exhibit A?

> Yes, your Honor. MR. AVERY:

That document with just one page or --THE COURT:

Two pages. MR. AVERY:

THE COURT: Two pages. So that's Exhibit A now?

MR. AVERY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK.

BY MR. AVERY:

Can you flip to the second page of that document.

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, I object to this document as hearsay, on hearsay, especially the handwritten portion --

THE COURT: Well, I'm assuming that -- Mr. Avery didn't say this with Mr. Soto, but I assume these documents are subject to questioning that will follow from his own clients or others that will in fact enable, despite their hearsay nature, to be admitted into evidence. So I will allow him to ask questions about these documents subject to connection and subject to their ultimate admission.

I agree with you that there is hearsay within hearsay, the handwritten information, and I don't know how he will necessarily overcome that problem, but I'm going to let him

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

deal with that in due course. Obviously, neither Mr. Soto nor Mr. Tapia prepared these documents so he can't offer them through these witnesses. But it's fair game and would otherwise be inefficient if he couldn't ask these witnesses questions. He didn't offer the exhibit that he showed to Mr. Soto into evidence because he couldn't, and he can't do that here but he wants to ask questions.

I note your objection but I would say it is premature. Let's see what questions are asked of his witnesses in order to either get these into evidence or not. All right?

MR. AVERY: That is right, your Honor. Just to clarify, our first witness is actually going to be the individual who managed payroll and whose handwriting that is and will explain what it was about.

THE COURT: I assume you had this all taken care of, but it is like a movie and we can't fast-forward. So we'll continue to watch in realtime. Go ahead.

MR. AVERY: OK.

BY MR. AVERY:

- Do you see the dates on that page? 0.
- 21 Yes. Α.
 - Ο. Immediately beneath your name. I just want you to look at those dates and then I will ask the question.
 - The date at the very bottom is June 26, 2016, correct?
- 25 Α. Yes.

J5mdtap1

- And the date immediately above that is August 6, 2016,
- 2 correct?

- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 And the date immediately above that is August 12, 2016, Q.
- 5 correct?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. You had an employee code by the time June 26, 2016 came
- around, correct? 8
- 9 THE INTERPRETER: June 6?
- 10 MR. AVERY: June 26, 2016.
- 11 Α. Yes.
- And you punched in on that day using that code, correct? 12
- 13 Yes. She showed me how to punch in. Α.
- 14 And you punched out that day as well, correct? Q.
- 15 Yes. Α.
- And you punched in on August 6, 2016, correct? 16 0.
- 17 Α. Yes.
- 18 And you punched out on August 6, 2016, correct?
- 19 Α. Yes.
- 20 And you punched in on August 12, 2016, correct? 0.
- 21 Α. Yes.
- 22 Q. And you punched out on August 12, 2016, correct?
- 23 Α. Yes.
- 24 June 26, 2016 is before July 1st, right? Ο. OK.
- 25 Α. Yes.

Tapia - cross

- 1 Q. So you did in fact have your employee number at the start
- 2 of your employment, didn't you?
- 3 A. No, they had not given it to me.
 - Q. How did you punch in without your employee number?
- 5 A. I don't remember. I don't remember. I don't remember.
 - THE COURT: Next question, please.
- 7 MR. AVERY: OK.
- 8 BY MR. AVERY:

4

- 9 Q. When did your employment end?
- 10 A. In January 2017.
- 11 | Q. And it's your testimony -- sorry.
- 12 And you worked three days a week?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. Every week?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 Q. Was the clock broken from August 12, 2016 until
- 17 | January 2017?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 | Q. Every single day?
- 20 A. I don't remember but -- I don't remember.
- 21 | Q. Did you punch in between I guess it would be August 13th,
- 22 | 2016 and January 2017 even once?
- 23 | A. I tried but the machine wouldn't allow me to enter. And it
- 24 was not only me, it was several people that happened, that they
- 25 weren't allowed to punch in.

- 1 Q. Every day?
- Twice a week, something like that. The other times that we 2
- 3 weren't allowed, we would write down the hours that was given
- 4 to the manager. Supposedly, they had fixed it and I don't see
- 5 it here.
- 6 Q. Let me try again.
- 7 Did you use the computer where you were entering your
- code even one time between August 13, 2016 and January 2017? 8
- 9 No. After that I didn't use it. Α.
- 10 You testified here before, right? Ο. OK.
- 11 Α. Yes.
- 12 In fact, in that very chair, right?
- 13 Α. Yes.
- 14 Do you recall previously testifying that it worked one
- day -- at least one day a week? 15
- MS. CONNOLLY: Objection. 16
- 17 Yes, I remember that.
- 18 THE COURT: Hold on. We now have everybody talking at
- 19 the same time.
- 20 I'm sorry. MR. AVERY:
- 21 THE COURT: So it is a little hard to manage. A
- 22 little hard for the court reporter, too.
- 23 So the question was, "Do you recall previously
- 24 testifying that it worked one day -- at least one day a week?"
- 25 And you are objecting to that.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 MS. CONNOLLY: Yes.

THE COURT: What is the basis of the objection?

MS. CONNOLLY: I don't think that that accurately characterizes his testimony.

THE COURT: Well, why don't you impeach him properly, Mr. Averv.

> MR. AVERY: Sure.

THE COURT: So I will sustain the objection with leave for you to rephrase it and impeach him using the transcript of the prior proceeding.

MR. AVERY: If we are going to do it, your Honor, actually, I would like to begin with the deposition first so I will do the hearing second.

THE COURT: It is your cross-examination, whatever you would like. But make it clear in your questions that you are asking him questions about a deposition rather than his prior testimony in a court proceeding.

MR. AVERY: Sure. Absolutely.

BY MR. AVERY:

- You also were deposed in this matter, right?
- Α. Yes.
- 22 And in that deposition you were under oath, right?
- 23 Α. Yes.
- 24 Do you recall being asked in your deposition whether the 25 machine was always -- strike that.

22

23

24

25

Do you recall in your deposition being asked whether 1 the machine was always off between August 13, 2016 and 2 3 January 2017? 4 Yes, I remember. Α. 5 And do you recall testifying that there --Ο. 6 THE COURT: What page are we on, please? 7 MR. AVERY: I'm sorry, your Honor. We are going to get to where -- and what I'm about to ask is 55/18. Page 55. 8 9 Q. And do you recall testifying that in fact if there were 10 entries by somebody between 8 and 9 p.m. on any of those days, 11 that the machine would in fact be working? 12 A. Yes. 13 MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, isn't that --14 THE COURT: Hold on a second. This is a little 15 jumbled here. 16 What were you going to say, Ms. Connolly? 17 MS. CONNOLLY: Isn't that not the way -- isn't the 18 question supposed to be read? 19 THE COURT: Yes. I don't quite understand, Mr. Avery. 20 Are you paraphrasing something?

MR. AVERY: I was. I can read it directly if you want, your Honor.

THE COURT: The proper way to impeach is to say, "Weren't you asked this question and didn't you give this answer?"

J5mdtap1 Tapia - cross 1 MR. AVERY: OK. THE COURT: 2 Not to summarize. 3 MR. AVERY: OK. 4 BY MR. AVERY: 5 Q. During that deposition, you were asked: "So would it be 6 safe to say, just so I can skip ahead, if somebody else used 7 the machine, let's say between 8 and 9 p.m." --THE INTERPRETER: You have to --8 9 THE COURT: You've got to go slower. We have an interpreter and a court reporter. 10 11 MR. AVERY: I'm sorry. 12 Q. Do you recall being asked: "So it would be safe to say, 13 just so I can skip ahead, if somebody else used the machine on 14 any given day, that was not a day on which the machine was 15 blocked or shut off?" 16 MS. CONNOLLY: And there is an objection. 17 THE COURT: And what is the objection? 18 MS. CONNOLLY: That it's several hypotheticals built into the question, which Mr. Avery omitted the "let's say 19 20

between 8 and 9 p.m."

THE COURT: Yes. You have to read the whole question.

MR. AVERY: I'm trying to do this fast, your Honor. will read the whole sequence.

THE COURT: It is not about speed. It is about accuracy.

21

22

23

24

MR. AVERY: 1 OK. So, let's start again. Let's read the THE COURT: 2 3 question again. 4 MR. AVERY: Let's go up to actually page 54. 5 THE COURT: We are skipping this? 6 MR. AVERY: We will strike that question. 7 THE COURT: Let's go to the next thing, then. 8 (Pause) 9 BY MR. AVERY: 10 Beginning on page 54, line 19, do you recall being 11 asked in your deposition: "But, again, how many days a week was it broken or off or blocked?" 12 13 THE COURT: OK. Then there was an objection. 14 The objection is overruled. 15 Read the answer. 16 BY MR. AVERY: 17 Q. And you answered: "Once or twice a week." THE COURT: Were you asked that question and did you 18 give that answer? 19 20 MS. CONNOLLY: That's not the -- sorry. That is not 21 the full answer. 22 MR. AVERY: I was going to keep going. 23 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. Finish reading the

24

25

answer.

BY MR. AVERY:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

"I would like to add something. We didn't start at the same time -- we didn't all start at the same time. different starting times. At the time we arrived, and before starting work, the machine wasn't on. I do not know if they turned it on or unblocked it at midnight. I don't mean that it was off or blocked for the whole night. Sometimes it was on but we didn't punch in because we have already worked for four hours, and what we did was write down the hours in a piece of paper and give it to the manager."

Do you recall testifying to that at your deposition? Α. Yes.

- And so now, then you were asked in your deposition: "So just so I understand, are you saying that there were days on which the machine was shut off or blocked for a particular segment of the day?"
 - THE INTERPRETER: A particular what?
- 17 MR. AVERY: Segment of the day.
- 18 Α. Yes.
 - MR. AVERY: Ms. Connolly objected.
- 20 THE COURT: Overruled. You can read the answer.
- 21 And your answer was: "Yes, that's correct." Q.
- 22 Α. Yes, correct.
- 23 And so you were asked: "So, would it be safe to say, just 24 so I can skip ahead, if somebody else used the machine, let's 25 say between 8 and 9 p.m. on any given day, that was not a day

- on which the machine was blocked or shut off?"
- THE COURT: There was an objection.
- 3 I overrule the objection.
- 4 MR. AVERY: And you said: "Yes, that's correct."
- 5 THE COURT: Were you asked those questions and did you
- 6 | give those answers?
- 7 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 8 THE COURT: Next.
- 9 MR. AVERY: Thank you. Permission to approach, your
- 10 Honor?
- 11 THE COURT: Yes.
- MR. AVERY: Sorry, Exhibit C. For the record, I am
- 13 showing the witness what has been marked as Defense Exhibit C.
- 14 BY MR. AVERY:
- 15 Q. Do you recognize that document?
- 16 | A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. Is that your signature on that document?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Did you sign that document before retaining a lawyer?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. Are you sure?
- 22 | A. No. Sorry. I already had my lawyer.
- 23 | Q. OK. Do you recall being asked about this document in your
- 24 deposition?
- 25 THE COURT: Mr. Avery, there is not a basis at this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

25

moment to impeach him with his earlier testimony. You should just ask him questions, and then if he gives you an answer that is inconsistent with --

> MR. AVERY: He did.

THE COURT: He did?

MR. AVERY: He did.

THE COURT: OK. Then go ahead.

MR. AVERY: Thank you, your Honor.

- Do you recall being asked about this document at your deposition?
- Α. Yes.
- 12 Q. Specifically --

13 What page and line, please? THE COURT:

-- 58, line 8, and it is going to go to MR. AVERY:

17.

Q. You were asked: "Tell me what happened that precipitated

17 you signing this document."

> And your answer was: "Well, I called from the place and they gave me the amounts stated here, and it wasn't fair for me to be given only this and that's the reason why I retained a lawyer's services."

And then you were asked: "Did you sign this before

23 you retained a lawyer's services?"

24 And you answered: "Yes."

Do you recall that portion of your deposition?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Do you recall specifically being asked those questions and giving those answers?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I remember.

So that testimony was incorrect? Q.

THE COURT: Which testimony?

MR. AVERY: The testimony that was provided in the deposition, or is it your testimony at trial? Which is correct?

The one that I'm giving here is correct. I didn't remember then. This is correct.

THE COURT: "This" meaning what you have just said here in court today?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

BY MR. AVERY:

- So then, just to be clear, then having you sign this document was not the reason you retained a lawyer?
- 17 I think so, that's the reason, because I already had the 18 lawyer but they made me sign this.

MR. AVERY: All right. I will move on. 19

- You testified -- sorry. You worked three days a week? 0.
- Α. Yes.

MR. AVERY: I am going to show the witness the Amended Complaint that I have marked as Defense Exhibit E.

I am going to go to paragraph 102 of the Amended It is page 21 of 34 of Defense Exhibit E. Complaint.

Case 1:17-cv-04936-JLC Document 140 Filed 07/08/19 Page 67 of 205

J5mdtap1 Tapia - cross

THE COURT: Page 21 did you say?

MR. AVERY: Yes, your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Are you directing the witness to look at

page 21?

2

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

22

23

25

MR. AVERY: Yes, because I am going to ask him a question about it.

7 THE COURT: All right. So if you could turn to page

8 | 21, please, Mr. Tapia.

MR. AVERY: Can I ask the interpreter, can you please translate for Mr. Tapia paragraph 102?

THE INTERPRETER: I interpret, so you read.

MR. AVERY: I will read.

THE COURT: You read it and she will interpret.

MR. AVERY: Paragraph 102 says: "Plaintiff Victor

15 | Tapia worked as a busboy" --

16 | THE INTERPRETER: Sorry. You have to go slower.

Q. "Plaintiff Victor Tapia worked as a busboy at Space New

York from July 2016 until January 2017. He regularly worked

19 two nights a week, and his shift typically lasted from 8 p.m.

20 | until 9 a.m."

Is that accurate as to the number of days you worked?

A. No.

- Q. So the allegations in your complaint are wrong?
- 24 | A. What was that?
 - Q. So this allegation in your complaint is wrong?

- This over here is not correct. Α.
- 2 Q. OK. Moving on.
- How long did you work at Eden Ballroom? 3
- 4 Like, half a year. Α.
- 5 OK. So, six months? Ο.
- 6 Α. Yes.
- 7 Do you recall in your deposition being asked about the start and end dates of your employment? 8
- 9 Not so well, but. Α.
- 10 Q. Specifically, I would like to go to page 9. OK.
- 11 THE INTERPRETER: Page 9?
- 12 MR. AVERY: Mm-hmm. Yes.
- No, not page 9 of that. 13 THE COURT:
- 14 MR. AVERY: I was telling the Judge.
- Q. You were asked, beginning on line 13: "Do you recall the 15 year in which you started working --16
- 17 THE COURT: Slowly, please.
- 18 MR. AVERY: Apologies.
- 19 "Do you recall the year in which you started working for 20 Eden Ballroom?"
- 21 THE COURT: Just one second. Just one second.
- 22 He is going to read you a question and an answer, and 23 then he's going to ask you, "Do you remember being asked that
- question and giving that answer?" So, let him finish, please. 24
- 25 Go again, please.

1 MR. AVERY: Sure.

2 | Q. Do you recall being asked: "Do you recall the year in

3 | which you started working for Eden Ballroom?"

Just, do you recall being asked that question?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And do you recall that your answer was: "2017, I believe."
- 7 | A. Yes.

4

5

- 8 Q. Was that correct?
- 9 | A. No.
- 10 | Q. So that was wrong?
- MS. CONNOLLY: Objection, your Honor.
- 12 THE COURT: Just one second.
- 13 A. I told them --
- 14 THE COURT: Just one second. Just one second.
- There is an objection to a question?
- MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, your Honor.
- 17 | THE COURT: What is the objection?
- 18 MS. CONNOLLY: The objection is asked and answered.
- 19 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 20 BY MR. AVERY:
- 21 | Q. And then do you recall being asked: "Do you recall if it
- 22 was the summer, fall, spring, or winter?"
- 23 Do you recall being asked that question?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. And you testified: "It was in winter."

Do you recall giving that answer?

Α. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Is July in the winter? 0.
- What happened is that I didn't remember exactly. Α. No. they asked me the question, it was which date I started working, and I said 2016 or '17. I didn't remember the year
- I'm asking you if July is in the winter.

exactly. I gave that answer already.

THE COURT: Mr. Avery, with all due respect, you're asking a lot of questions of the witness you don't need to ask. Obviously, July is not in the winter.

> MR. AVERY: OK.

When you cross-examine someone and impeach THE COURT: them with prior testimony, all you need to do is have what their answers were from the prior testimony in the record. can then, in closing argument, make whatever arguments you want to make. You are now asking questions that are borderline argumentative. As a result, you are eliciting from the witness answers that would otherwise only come out on redirect if Ms. Connolly chose to pursue that, which she may or may not. you are frankly overlitigating and overpursuing things that you need not do for purposes of the record.

He said what he did before. He said what he did now. You're going to argue inconsistencies, and that will be whatever the record shows. So, I don't think you need to ask

Tapia - cross

- questions like, "Is July in the winter?" We all know July 1 isn't in the winter. All you are trying to do is impeach him 2 3 with what he said prior to today and what he said today. You don't need to belabor it, if you will. 4
 - MR. AVERY: OK.
- 6 THE COURT: OK?
- 7 MR. AVERY: Thank you.
- 8 BY MR. AVERY:

- 9 Q. Do you recall being asked -- strike that.
- 10 When did your employment with Eden end again? And I 11 realize it was asked.
- 12 Α. In January '17.
- 13 Do you recall being asked in your deposition: "Did your Ο.
- 14 employment with Eden Ballroom ultimately come to an end?"
- Do you recall being asked that? 15
- 16 Α. Yes.
- 17 And you answered: "Yes." Ο.
- 18 Α. Yes.
- 19 And then you were asked: "When did it end?" Q.
- 20 Correct?
- 21 Α. Yes.
- 22 Q. And you answered: "I believe it ended in 2018."
- 23 Yes, because I didn't remember --Α.
- 24 THE COURT: No. No. No. I'm sorry, Mr. Tapia,
- 25 but he asked you a question, with all respect, somewhat

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

inartfully. The better way is to say, "You were asked this question and gave this answer, correct?" "Yes." Next. Otherwise, he is going to want to explain because of the way you are doing this. OK? The way you need to impeach is by presenting him with the question and the answer at the same time to confirm that was accurate at the time it was asked and answered by him. If he disagrees, it's Ms. Connolly's responsibility to correct the record, if you will, if she chooses to do that. Don't ask it in piecemeal fashion, otherwise you are going to start getting answers that go beyond

> MR. AVERY: OK.

BY MR. AVERY:

what you're asking.

- Q. Do you recall being asked: "Do you recall the month or season of 2018 in which your employment ended?" and your answer was, "The month I don't remember, but it was in the summer." A. Yes.
- THE COURT: Do you remember that question and that answer?
- THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 21 BY MR. AVERY:
- 22 Did you ever receive a paycheck?
- 23 THE COURT: From whom?
- 24 MR. AVERY: From Eden Ballroom.
- 25 Yes, I received a check. And when I deposited it in the

4

5

6

7

8

9

- bank, three days after they bounced it.
- Q. And just so I understand, is that separate from the check 2 3 you received when you signed Defense Exhibit C?

MS. CONNOLLY: Objection.

THE COURT: I think the record is not clear enough for that question to make sense.

MR. AVERY: OK.

THE COURT: So, sustained.

- BY MR. AVERY:
- 10 Did you receive a check when you signed Defense Exhibit C?
- 11 Α. Yes.
- 12 And the check that you are referring to that bounced, that
- 13 was a different check, right?
- 14 Α. Yes.
- And that check that bounced was for the hours reflected on 15 Ο.
- Defense Exhibit A, correct? 16
- 17 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection.
- 18 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 19 A. No.
- 20 THE COURT: The answer is struck. The question is an
- 21 improper question. The objection is sustained.
- 22 Q. Did you receive a check for the hours reflected on Defense
- Exhibit A? 23
- 24 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection.
- 25 THE COURT: Sustained.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

1 THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: The answer is struck.

Wait until I rule. Please tell him to wait if there is an objection.

MR. AVERY: I don't understand the basis of the objection.

THE COURT: Ask your next question.

Q. Were you paid for the hours set forth on Defense Exhibit A that you testified you punched in and out for?

THE COURT: That's a different question than what you just asked before.

MR. AVERY: I didn't understand if it was the check because of the objection. Sorry.

A. (In English) No.

THE COURT: Do you understand the question that's pending?

THE INTERPRETER: I didn't interpret the whole question.

THE COURT: All right. Let's start over.

Ask the question again.

- Q. Were you paid for the hours set forth on Defense Exhibit A that you testified you punched in and out for?
- 23 A. No.
 - Do you recall being asked in your deposition: "Did you receive any checks during" --

THE COURT: What page, please?

MR. AVERY: Sorry. 40.

THE COURT: 40?

MR. AVERY: 40.

Q. -- "during your employment at Eden Ballroom?"

And your answer was: "I only received one."

A. Yes. Yes.

Q. And then you were asked: "And it was for the hours

reflected on Defense Exhibit 3A?"

And your answer: "Yes."

A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

21

23

25

MR. AVERY: One second.

(Pause)

I have no further questions at this time.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Connolly, redirect.

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, your Honor.

17 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. CONNOLLY:

Q. Mr. Tapia, you didn't --

20 | THE COURT: Watch. You are leading. You are already

leading. In three words you are leading. You can't lead.

22 BY MR. AVERY:

Q. Mr. Tapia, Defense Exhibit D, the Amended Complaint --

24 THE COURT: That's E.

Q. E. Sorry. Defense Exhibit E, the Amended Complaint, what

J5mdtap1

Tapia - redirect

- role, if any, did you have in creating this document? 1
- Α. 2 I don't understand.
- 3 THE COURT: Ask it a different way.
- Were you involved in the creation of Defense Exhibit E? 4 Q.
- 5 Α. Yes.
- Were you the author? Did you write this document? 6 0.
- 7 Α. No.
- 8 Q. And Defense Exhibit A, did you create that document?
- 9 Α. No.
- 10 Have you ever seen this document before -- did you ever see
- 11 this document before your deposition and your prior testimony
- 12 here in this courtroom?
- 13 Α. No.
- Does page 12 of Defense Exhibit A accurately reflect all 14
- 15 the dates and hours you worked at Space?
- 16 THE COURT: Directing you to the bottom of page 12,
- 17 where there are three dates listed.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Mr. Tapia, does that reflect every single day and every
- 20 single hour you worked at Space?
- 21 Α. No.
- 22 Q. You worked -- how many days, approximately, did you work at
- 23 Space for the entire period of your employment?
- 24 Α. Three days a week.
- 25 And was that number of days per week ever varied?

- Α. No. It was always the same.
- What about when there were special events? 2 Q.
- 3 When there were special events, then, yes, there would be
- 4 like a fourth day.
- OK. What special events, if any, did you work at Space? 5 0.
- Like Halloween, Christmas, New Year. 6 Α.
- 7 And how did your employment at Space come to an end?
- Well, the same. Since they didn't pay me the hours, I had 8
- 9 to pay my rent and things like that so I had to find another
- 10 job.
- 11 And when was it that your employment ended?
- 12 Α. In January 2017.
- 13 And do you remember -- do you remember going to your Ο.
- 14 deposition -- do you remember what date your deposition was
- 15 taken on?
- THE COURT: I'm sure he doesn't. I'm sure I wouldn't 16
- 17 and I'm sure you wouldn't. Why don't you just say that this
- 18 deposition was taken on January 9th of this year?
- 19 Q. Do you recall that your deposition was taken on
- 20 January 9th of 2019?
- 21 Α. Yes.
- 22 Q. And Mr. Avery asked you about your testimony in that
- 23 deposition. Can you explain why you said that your employment
- 24 at Space began in the winter of 2017 at your deposition?
- 25 Well, what happened is that I didn't remember the year, so

year.

I told them I think it was 2016 or '17. I don't remember the 1

- 3 Q. And had you done anything to prepare yourself for your
- 4 deposition in terms of the dates of your employment prior to
- 5 your deposition?
- A. No. 6

2

- 7 Do you have any paper records at home that reflect the
- dates of your employment at Space? 8
- 9 Α. No.
- 10 Did you mean to give inaccurate testimony at your
- 11 deposition by misreporting the dates of your employment?
- 12 Yes -- I don't understand. Can you repeat it?
- 13 Yes. Did you intend to lie at your deposition? 0.
- 14 Α. No. No.
- How is it that you continued with this lawsuit after you 15 Q.
- 16 signed Exhibit D?
- 17 THE COURT: You don't mean D. You mean C.
- 18 MS. CONNOLLY: I'm sorry.
- Q. Defense Exhibit C? 19
- 20 THE COURT: The document that had your signature on
- 21 it.
- 22 MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, Exhibit C.
- 23 How is it you continued with the lawsuit after that? 0.
- 24 Well, yes, I had to continue working. I didn't have work Α.
- 25 at that time.

OK. Q.

1

3

2 THE COURT: I don't think he understood your question.

- Why did you continue with this lawsuit after you signed
- 4 Exhibit -- or Defense Exhibit C?
- 5 A. Oh, because -- because they didn't pay me the hours, just
- 6 were giving us the tips, and, yes, I need to be paid what I
- 7 worked for.
- 8 The paperwork you said that you were given when you met the
- 9 manager who we've described as the Asian lady, was that
- 10 paperwork that you filled out and returned or paperwork that
- 11 was physically given to you to keep?
- 12 A. No, I filled it out and they kept it. They didn't give me
- 13 copies or anything.
- 14 Q. OK. Now, Mr. Tapia, directing your attention again to
- 15 Defense Exhibit A.
- Do you know whether or not the dates on page 12 and 16
- 17 what is shown as the time in and time out, do you know whether
- 18 or not those are correct?
- 19 No, they're not correct. Α.
- 20 OK. But. --Ο.
- 21 No, they're not. Α.
- 22 So you don't know whether or not you punched in or out on
- 23 these dates, is that right?
- 24 Yes, correct. I don't know. Α.
- 25 Mr. Tapia, you didn't work at the same time -- at the Q. OK.

Tapia - recross

same time as Mr. Soto, correct?

A. No.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

19

20

21

22

23

MS. CONNOLLY: OK. I have no further questions.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Any recross?

MR. AVERY: Yes, your Honor, just briefly.

THE COURT: We are going to take a recess once this

witness is concluded.

MR. AVERY: I may just have one question, your Honor,

10 and it is for clarification.

11 | RECROSS-EXAMINATION

12 BY MR. AVERY:

- Q. Are you saying the times indicated on Defense Exhibit A are
- 14 | incorrect?
- 15 A. Yes. For me, yes.
- 16 | Q. So you're saying you -- why do you say that?

MS. CONNOLLY: Objection. Form.

THE COURT: I'm sorry?

MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form.

THE COURT: It's not the most artful question but I

will allow it if he can answer it.

MR. AVERY: I can rephrase it.

- Q. Why do you believe they are incorrect?
- 24 A. Because I worked three days per week, and here you see that

25 since three days are not there per week. And a question, why

2015 is here? 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: 2015 is not there. He is looking at the wrong thing.

Does he see his name? Do you see your name, Mr. Tapia, down at the bottom? Do you see the three dates? And they are all 2016 dates, correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: That's what Mr. Avery is asking you about, just those three dates.

And do you see, with respect to those three dates, there are hours associated with each of those three dates? we have been through this before. Do you see that?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Time in and time out for each of those three dates.

And what they're asking you is for those three dates -- never mind anything else -- but for those three dates, are those time in and out accurate or not accurate?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: They are accurate for those three dates; is that your testimony?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. AVERY: No further questions.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, your Honor, just very quickly.

Tapia - further redirect

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

21

22

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

2 | BY MS. CONNOLLY:

Q. Mr. Tapia, you previously said that you did not create

Defense Exhibit --

THE COURT: No. No. No. No.

MS. CONNOLLY: OK.

THE COURT: That is improper.

MS. CONNOLLY: OK.

THE COURT: Just ask a question.

BY MS. CONNOLLY:

11 Q. Mr. Tapia, what reason do you have to believe that this

12 | document is accurate?

13 THE COURT: Let me -- you mean the hours that are set

forth in the document are accurate?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes.

16 | THE INTERPRETER: Do you want to rephrase it?

17 MS. CONNOLLY: OK.

18 | Q. Mr. Tapia, what reason do you have to believe that the

19 | hours shown on Defense Exhibit A for you on the three dates

20 | listed are accurate?

A. It's in the papers what it says.

Q. So you had --

23 THE COURT: No. No. I don't like where that is

24 going. Ask the question. Don't say you had no idea or

25 | whatever, that's not a proper question.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

BY MS. CONNOLLY:

Is there any other reason that you have to believe that this is accurate, that the hours set forth are accurate?

THE COURT: Any other reason besides that that is on the paper?

- Q. Mr. Tapia, do you have any reason other than besides the hours shown on the paper to believe that these hours are accurate?
- I think it's not correct. It's not correct, but.

THE COURT: Hold on a minute, Mr. Tapia.

You just answered my question, less than two minutes ago, when I asked you very specifically about the hours for these dates, and you said they were accurate. Ms. Connolly is now asking you what's your basis for that, and you said because it's on the paper. And she said do you have any other reasons. And now you say it's not accurate. So, you have to make up your mind. Is it either accurate or not accurate?

THE WITNESS: Yes, it is correct.

THE COURT: And are you saying that because you remember that on those particular days those were the hours you worked, or something else?

THE WITNESS: No, no. Yes, those are the hours I worked.

24 BY MS. CONNOLLY:

And your basis for saying that it's not correct includes

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Tapia - further redirect

the fact that it doesn't have all of the days that you worked, right?

> MR. AVERY: I object.

THE COURT: Sustained. That's an improper question.

You could ask something along those lines but not the way you just asked it.

BY MS. CONNOLLY:

Q. What, if anything -- what hours, if any, are missing from this document?

THE COURT: Well, we've been over this. We have Exhibit 1. You are advocating that he worked not just these days but other days. That is already in evidence. So what beyond that do you want from him at this moment that hasn't already been asked?

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, just to sort of rehabilitate the witness, your Honor, because it's been a little confusing.

THE COURT: That's an understatement.

What is your question?

any, are missing from this document?

MS. CONNOLLY: I asked the question. Is that --

THE COURT: What, if anything -- what hours, if any, are missing from this document? That's the question, Mr. Tapia.

Do you want to translate it for him. What hours, if

THE WITNESS: Yes. More hours are missing.

24 25

1 MS. CONNOLLY: OK, Mr. Tapia. That's all I have. 2 THE COURT: All right. I have a few questions,

Mr. Tapia.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Did you have any other jobs besides when you worked at Eden Ballroom during the period you say you worked there? Were you employed elsewhere as well?

THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: That was your only job?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: And just, can I ask counsel, you have been referring to "Eden Ballroom" and "Space" interchangeably. it agreed that they are one and the same, or are they something different than one and the same? Because sometimes there are questions about Eden Ballroom and sometimes there are questions about Space.

MS. CONNOLLY: Space is the name of the club and Eden Ballroom is the owner.

THE COURT: Is that accurate?

MR. AVERY: Yes.

THE COURT: So you understood you worked for Space, is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: The two gentlemen that are sitting at the back table, Mr. Tapia, have you ever seen them before?

THE WITNESS: Yes, all the time there.

J5mdtap1 Tapia - further redirect

1 THE COURT: Yes? Did you ever meet them? THE WITNESS: Yes. 2 THE COURT: You have had conversations with them? 3 4 THE WITNESS: No, but except when they call me to sign 5 the paper. 6 THE COURT: Other than that, that's the only time? 7 THE WITNESS: Yes. 8 THE COURT: All right. And you say you worked three 9 days each week, correct? 10 THE WITNESS: Yes. 11 THE COURT: And you were working 10 hours each day 12 that you worked, is that right? 13 THE WITNESS: Yes. 14 THE COURT: Not less than 10 and not more than 10 but 15 10, is that correct? 16 THE WITNESS: Yes. 17 THE COURT: All right. Do you know how many other 18 employees there were at Space when you worked there? THE WITNESS: Yes, there were several workers. There 19 20 were like -- like -- sorry, like nine, maybe. Nine of the ones 21 that we worked with that were doing almost the same that I was 22 doing, but there were more people working. 23 THE COURT: Were there more than 15 employees in 24 total?

THE WITNESS: I think more.

25

J5mdtap1

1	THE COURT: All right.
2	All right. Anybody else have any follow-up questions
3	in light of anything I may have just asked the witness? Ms.
4	Connolly or Mr. Avery?
5	MR. AVERY: No, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: So shall we excuse the witness at this
7	point? Yes?
8	MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, your Honor.
9	THE COURT: All right. I hear nothing further from
10	counsel.
11	Mr. Tapia, you are excused.
12	(Witness excused)
13	THE COURT: We will take a recess.
14	THE CLERK: All rise.
15	THE COURT: Before we do, Ms. Connolly, let me ask
16	you, what is next?
17	MS. CONNOLLY: The plaintiff
18	THE COURT: Any other witnesses?
19	MS. CONNOLLY: No.
20	THE COURT: You are going to rest?
21	MS. CONNOLLY: Yes.
22	THE COURT: So, Mr. Avery, who are we going to hear
23	after the break?
24	MR. AVERY: Devlyn is going to be our first witness.
25	THE COURT: Who is this? I'm sorry.

MR. AVERY: 1 Devlyn. She is on the list. She is the 2 payroll supervisor. 3 THE COURT: OK. And she is present? Yes. She went downstairs. 4 MR. AVERY: THE COURT: 5 I see. So you are going to get her during the recess? 6 7 MR. AVERY: I am. THE COURT: So you should plan to have that witness 8 9 ready to go if that is your next witness, because we are going to start at 12:10, 12:15. 10 11 MR. AVERY: We can have no lunch? 12 THE COURT: No. We are going to have a lunch break at 1 o'clock. 13 14 Oh, OK. I am sorry. MR. AVERY: 15 THE COURT: I assume that we will at least get one other witness done before lunch. Maybe more. I don't know how 16 17 long your witnesses are going to be. 18 MR. AVERY: I don't think it is going to be long at 19 all, your Honor. 20 The only other thing I wanted to ask was, if she is 21 resting, there were some things that I wanted to request your 22 Honor to take judicial notice of, just dates on the calendar 23 and what day they corresponded to, June 22nd --24 THE COURT: All right. Is any of this contested?

Have you discussed this with Ms. Connolly?

25

1 MS. CONNOLLY: No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Why don't you discuss this with her over the break, and maybe you all can stipulate to things like is January 12th a Tuesday kind of thing. I am not sure that is something that is going to be necessary for judicial notice. It may be the parties agree to that, if you have calendars or what have you.

So, we will start up at 12:15. Talk to Ms. Connolly if there are any judicial notice issues, and have your next witness ready to go.

MR. AVERY: OK.

THE COURT: OK.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Everyone may be seated.

OK. So just to be clear, Ms. Connolly, you are resting, is that correct?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. Now, Mr. Avery, you are on the air.

MR. AVERY: Thank you, your Honor.

The defense calls its first witness, Devlyn Storino.

THE COURT: All right, Ms. Storino.

And did you want to -- is there any stipulation or anything or do it at lunch?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ AVERY: We will do it at lunch because she has to check the dates that I am asking for.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

THE COURT: I see. OK. I don't understand why this wasn't done before today, but, in any event, we will have the witness proceed.

DEVLYN STORINO,

called as a witness by the defendants,

having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Please state your full name and spell your full name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Devlyn Storino. D-e-v-l-y-n S-t-o-r-i-n-o.

> THE COURT: Go right ahead, Mr. Avery.

MR. AVERY: Thank you, your Honor.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

- BY MR. AVERY: 14
- 15 Q. Ms. Storino, by whom were you employed in 2016?
- Eden Ballroom. 16 Α.
- 17 And what was your position? Q.
- I was the office manager. I did the payroll as well. 18
- 19 And in your capacity as office manager, what job functions Q.
- 20 did you perform?
- 21 A. Payroll, financial reports, stuff like that, bookkeeping
- 22 mostly.
- 23 Q. And that was, just to be clear, the payroll of the
- 24 employees?
- 25 I did the employees payroll, yes.

Storino - direct

- I am going to show you what's been marked as Defense 1 Exhibit D2. Defense Exhibit D2. 2
- 3 Do you recognize that document?
- Yes, I do. 4 Α.
- 5 What is it? Ο.
- 6 It's a labor report. Α.
- 7 And what does that consist of?
- 8 These are accurate like punch-in times and punch-out times
- 9 of each employee.
- 10 And is there an employee listed on there? Q.
- 11 Α. This one in particular is Saul Soto.
- 12 OK. Did you handle those reports?
- 13 Α. Yes.
- And then so can you explain to me sort of how they get 14
- 15 generated?
- 16 The employee has to come into work and punch in in
- 17 our POS system, point of sale, into Aloha. It is a POS system.
- 18 It is a computer screen that they punch in a number that they
- 19 are assigned to, so it is their ID number, and that tells us
- 20 what time they came into work.
- 21 And those are reports are generate by whom?
- 22 Α. I generate them.
- 23 So, did you generate that report? 0.
- 24 Α. I did, yes.
- 25 We move Defense Exhibit D2 into evidence. MR. AVERY:

top, is that right?

THE COURT: Any objection? 1 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection, your Honor. The witness 2 3 just said this was Saul Soto's report. 4 THE COURT: I'm sorry? 5 THE WITNESS: Yes. 6 MS. CONNOLLY: And there is also handwriting on here 7 which would be hearsay within hearsay. THE WITNESS: That is mine. 8 9 THE COURT: I don't think a proper foundation has yet 10 been laid for this document, so I am not admitting it, with 11 leave to ask further questions to see whether it can be 12 admitted. 13 Where is the handwriting on this particular document? 14 I don't see any handwriting on D2. I think you are thinking of 15 the other one. There is no handwriting on this. Is there, or 16 am I not seeing it? 17 MS. CONNOLLY: The copy that I have is --THE COURT: The Saul Soto record document has 18 handwriting on it? 19 20 MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, page 12. 21 THE COURT: I don't have a page 12, I don't think. 22 MS. CONNOLLY: OK. 23 THE COURT: Page -- no, I don't have a page 12. In 24 The last page of D2 has 9/11/2014 to 10/05/2017 at the D2?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CONNOLLY: 10/5/2017, yes. But the witness just said that the handwriting was hers.

THE COURT: What handwriting? Where is there handwriting in this exhibit? I don't see it. Is there?

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, I'm sorry. I think I was referring to the other one but I --

THE COURT: Right. Exactly.

MS. CONNOLLY: I don't understand why the witness said the handwriting was hers, though.

THE COURT: Did you see handwriting somewhere?

THE WITNESS: No, there is no handwriting on this document. If there were handwriting, it would be mine, but there isn't any on this document.

THE COURT: I don't want you to speculate. We will ask you if any handwriting is actually your handwriting.

THE WITNESS: But there is nothing on here.

THE COURT: But in any event, a proper foundation for admission of this hearsay document has not yet been laid, so I am not going to admit it unless and until that is done properly.

MR. AVERY: OK.

BY MR. AVERY:

- Q. First, when you said this was Saul Soto's record, what did you mean by that?
- It's his name and employee ID on the report.

Storino - direct

- So this is a record of his punch-in times? 1
- 2 Α. Yes.
- 3 OK. 0.
- 4 This is a record of Saul Soto's punch-in times for I don't Α.
- 5 know if it is -- from the dates of 3/9/2017 through whatever
- 6 date it goes until, 3/14/2015. So, that's what this is showing
- 7 here.
- Does this document belong to the company? 8
- 9 It comes from the company's computer system, I mean, Aloha 10 system.
- 11 And what do you do with this document? What do you use it 12 for?
- 13 Α. To verify hours to pay people for payroll.
- 14 And do you do that on a weekly basis? Q.
- 15 Α. Mm-hmm, yes.
- Every week? 16 0.
- 17 Α. Yes.
- 18 MR. AVERY: At this point I think we have satisfied the business record exception. 19
- 20 THE COURT: I don't think so. You haven't asked what
- 21 I'll call the magic questions about these documents. There are
- 22 certain questions that are always asked with respect to
- 23 business records. Do you know what I am referring to?
- 24 MR. AVERY: I can keep going, your Honor.
- 25 I mean, look, this is a bench trial, and I THE COURT:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

don't want to, you know, take undue time here. But, I mean, the first question is: Is this document kept in the regular course of Eden Ballroom's business?

MR. AVERY: I thought that would be leading. That's why I didn't --

THE COURT: That's not leading. That is the explicit question that needs to be asked. And not only is it kept in the regular course of business, but is it the regularly accepted practice that it is kept in that fashion? And is this part of -- it is regularly conducted business activity? Those are the questions you need to be asking. There is nothing leading about any of those questions. And if you want to get this in under the business records exception, that's what you need to be asking. OK?

- 15 BY MR. AVERY:
- Q. Was this regularly maintained in the ordinary course of 16 17 business?
- 18 Yes, it was. Α.
- 19 And was this regularly kept for business purposes? Q.
- 20 Α. Yes.
- 21 By the company? Q.
- 22 Α. Yes.
- 23 THE COURT: And it was the regular practice of Eden 24 Ballroom to keep records like this of its employees?
- 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

MR. AVERY: I move to admit the exhibit.

MS. CONNOLLY: I still object to its admission, your There has been no testimony that this is -- that these punch-in and punch-out dates are accurate and who created this document, and Ms. --

THE COURT: She said she created this document. She testified exactly to that, within the last five minutes.

THE WITNESS: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: You can cross-examine her about the hours.

Your objection is overruled. Exhibit D2 is admitted into evidence.

(Defendants' Exhibit D2 received in evidence)

MR. AVERY: I would like to show the witness Defense Exhibit A, as we took that page off.

- Ο. There are two pages on Defense Exhibit A. Let's start with page 2. Can you flip to page 2.
- Do you recognize this document?
- 18 Α. Yes.
 - What is this document? Q.
 - This is a labor report again, but it's for Victor Tapia. Α.
- 21 OK. And was this also maintained in the ordinary course of Q.
- 22 business?
- 23 Α. Yes.
- 24 Ο. Was this also preserved by the company on a regular basis?
- 25 Α. Yes.

J5mdtap1

Storino - direct

- 1 And your testimony with respect to Exhibit D, would that
- 2 apply equally to Exhibit A --
- 3 Yes. Α.
- 4 -- insofar as how they are generated? Q.
- 5 Α. Yes.
- 6 Now, on this document there is some handwriting. Do you
- 7 see it?
- 8 Α. I do.
- 9 Is that yours? Ο.
- 10 Α. Yes.
- 11 And, by the way, who generated this document?
- 12 Α. I generated it.
- 13 And what -- tell me, why did you write on this? 0. OK.
- 14 Because I used this document to run payroll, and one of the Α.
- punch-in -- punch-out times is -- says 11 o'clock, and he did 15
- not punch out at 11 o'clock, so I wrote an explanation as to 16
- 17 why I was changing the hour from 11 to the time that I changed
- 18 it to. So, I was just writing an explanation. So I go over
- 19 these thoroughly and to make sure they are accurate, and so
- 20 there was just one time for the punch out that was not -- it
- 21 just means he didn't clock out, basically, for that day.
- 22 Q. And do you see the "6/26 Tips," that line? Can you read
- 23 that?
- 24 Α. I'm sorry, 6/26?
- 25 It says, "6/26." Q.

Storino - direct

- Oh, that. OK. "Tips paid" -- OK, so tips paid, owed for 1
- hours, 17.55 times 7.50 equals \$131.63. So, basically saying 2
- 3 that we paid him that amount.
 - Q. OK.

4

- MR. AVERY: Move to admit Defendant's Exhibit A. 5
- 6 What about the handwriting on the next THE COURT:
- 7 page?
- 8 MR. AVERY: I apologize, your Honor. I forgot we have
- 9 both pages.
- 10 Q. Can you turn the page back, actually. It is the first
- 11 page.
- Mm-hmm. OK. 12 Α.
- 13 Is that your handwriting? 0.
- 14 A. Yes, this is.
- 15 Q. OK. And what is this explaining, if you can go ahead and
- read it? 16
- 17 It says he worked three days total, which I got from the
- 18 three dates that are on the report, that he was paid by
- paycheck, so by a payroll company for these dates that I 19
- 20 listed, 8/12 and 8/6, and he was paid his tips 6/26, and that
- 21 he was owed \$289.67.
- 22 Ο. Which included?
- 23 Everything. Α.
- 24 But the handwriting from the prior page? Ο. Right.
- 25 Yes. Yes. So this is a summary of everything. Α.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- This was your analysis of what he was paid and what he was owed?
 - A. Exactly. So that he would have, you know, a record of -clearly stating what he was paid and if he was owed anything.

MR. AVERY: I move to admit Defendants' Exhibit A.

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, this is again two documents.

MR. AVERY: She can call it A1 and A2.

THE COURT: When you are saying it is two documents, you are saying the one at the bottom where it says "Default clock out" is a separate document from the one on the next page that says "Worked 3 Days," is that what you are saying, Ms. Connolly?

MS. CONNOLLY: The first page is the Employee Guidance record.

THE COURT: No. He separated that out already. is not what we are looking at.

MS. CONNOLLY: No. No. Then I don't have that objection.

THE COURT: So you are not objecting to this? MS. CONNOLLY: I do object to the admission of this document. I don't think that a sufficient foundation has been made and I object to its admission.

THE COURT: Ms. Storino.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: When was this document first printed? 1 THE WITNESS: It says here October 5, 2017, at 2 3 7:03 p.m. 4 THE COURT: Where is that? 5 THE WITNESS: The upper right-hand corner. 6 THE COURT: OK. And when did you put these 7 handwritten notes on the document, if you recall? THE WITNESS: The same day that I generated the 8 9 report. 10 THE COURT: And what would have prompted you to 11 generate this report on October 5th? 12 THE WITNESS: I believe because it was requested. 13 THE COURT: OK, it was requested. 14 THE WITNESS: Yeah, it was requested of me to do so. 15 THE COURT: And this report, like the one for Mr. Soto, is one that is kept in the regular course of Eden 16 17 Ballroom or Space's business, is that correct? 18 THE WITNESS: Oh, yes. THE COURT: And it is the regular practice of Eden 19 20 Ballroom or Space to keep time records for its employees, is 21 that correct? 22 THE WITNESS: Yes. 23 THE COURT: And these documents memorialize that, 24 consistent with those practice, is that correct? 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

THE COURT: And the notes you wrote here you wrote at the time to explain why the hours were what they were?

THE WITNESS: Exactly.

THE COURT: All right. Objection overruled. admitted into evidence, Exhibit A.

(Defendants' Exhibit A received in evidence)

BY MR. AVERY:

- Q. And at the very top -- it is actually on both pages but you can go ahead and turn to the second page of the exhibit because that is the one that has the dates on it. At the very top under "Labor," there is a time period. What does that time period refer to?
- A. That is the time period of when the business opened. So I just wanted from the very start until the current date that I generated the report. So, I wanted all the dates that he clocked in for that he worked for the entirety of the business being open.
- Q. So dates set forth on this document are the entirety of his clock-in and clock-out times?
- 20 Yes. Α. Yes.
- 21 There are no other records for a different time period 22 or --
- 23 The business -- the start date here is 9/10/2014. 24 That would have been the first date anyone could have worked.
- 25 That is the first day of business. And 10/5/2017 is the date

Storino - cross

- that I generated the report, so it was up to the current date. 1
- And just real quick, on these reports, the time in and 2 Q. OK.
- 3 time outs -- I will take a for instance. On this page, if you
- 4 actually look at the first entry -- it is actually the last
- 5 chronologically, but the first entry on the page for Mr. Tapia,
- 6 the time in says 21:31. Is that military time?
- 7 Α. It is, yes.
- 8 So that would be 9:31 p.m., right?
- 9 Α. Yes.
- 10 OK. And then 6:43 would then be a.m. Am I understanding
- 11 that right?
- 12 Α. Yes, that is correct.
- 13 Did Mr. Tapia ever give you -- himself ever give you a
- 14 handwritten signed time sheet where he wrote his hours?
- 15 I don't believe so, no. That's not really general
- 16 practice.
- 17 MR. AVERY: No further questions. OK.
- 18 THE COURT: Ms. Connolly.
- CROSS-EXAMINATION 19
- 20 BY MS. CONNOLLY:
- 21 Ms. Storino, you no longer work for Eden Ballroom, correct?
- 22 Α. Correct.
- 23 And your employment ended when?
- 24 MS. CONNOLLY: Sorry, Mr. Avery, you asked her that
- 25 but I didn't hear the answer.

J5mdtap1 Storino - cross

- 1 THE COURT: I don't think he did.
- December 2018. 2 Α.
- And you began working at Eden Ballroom when? 3
- I'm trying to think back. 2015, in March. Yeah, 4 Α.
- 5 March 2015.
- 6 And did you have a specific shift that you worked there? 0.
- 7 Daytime. Α.
- 8 Q. And what were your hours?
- 9 11 to 7. 11 a.m. to 7 p.m. Α.
- 10 Did you punch in and punch out? Ο.
- No, I did not. I was on salary so it is different. 11
- 12 Did you have any duties and responsibilities with respect
- 13 to the serving staff, the bussers and the bartenders?
- 14 I did their payroll. Α.
- 15 Did you have any supervisory responsibilities over the wait Q.
- staff and the service staff? 16
- 17 I -- no. Α.
- 18 OK. You had the ability to enter the POS system to change
- the hours in the records, correct? 19
- 20 Α. No.
- 21 Well, you've testified that you changed the hours on the
- 22 written report to correct them, correct?
- 23 MR. AVERY: Objection.
- 24 Α. No.
- 25 THE COURT: Hold on one second.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

That objection is sustained.

And as I admonished Mr. Avery, I'll admonish you. Please don't ask questions where you say you testified on direct X. Whatever she did testify to on direct, we have in the record. So you just need to ask the question however you wish to, but don't incorporate your memory of what she said. Just ask your question.

- BY MS. CONNOLLY:
- Q. You crossed out the punch-out hour on Mr. Tapia's time sheet that showed 11 a.m., correct?
- 11 Α. Correct.
- 12 So you did have the ability to change the hours that were 13 generated on this Aloha report, correct?
 - A. No, I did not, because if I could change the hours, it would be changed on this report, but I had to cross it off with I couldn't change what's printed in the reports.
- Oh, OK. 18 Q.

don't have access to do that.

- That's why I crossed it off with a pencil and just crossed 19 20 off 11 a.m. I wasn't able to change it.
- So your access was limited to generating payroll reports 21 22 and labor reports, correct?
- 23 Α. Exactly, yes.
- 24 And there were others -- there were people at Space or Eden 25 Ballroom who had the ability to access the software to change

- the hours to your knowledge, correct? 1
- 2 No, not to my knowledge. Α.
- 3 OK. Who requested you to run this report?
- I don't recall. It was two years ago. I don't know. 4 Α.
- 5 Were you regularly requested to run labor reports and
- 6 payroll reports?
- 7 Yes, I was.
- And who typically would be the person or persons to ask you 8
- 9 to run these reports?
- 10 I would run them on a regular basis to do the payroll, and
- 11 otherwise an employee would ask me to do one or a manager if
- 12 they needed it, but I always, you know, ran them regularly
- 13 anyways.
- 14 Q. Were you asked to generate this report in connection with
- 15 this litigation?
- No. It was already generated. 16
- 17 Do you know when this litigation was filed? Ο.
- No, I don't. 18 Α.
- 19 So your answer that this was already generated then has
- 20 nothing to do -- you don't know whether or not it was asked to
- 21 be run in connection with this litigation, correct?
- Objection. 22 MR. AVERY:
- 23 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 24 Next question.
- 25 BY MS. CONNOLLY:

- You don't know who asked you to run this report and you 1
- don't know why this report was run, is that right? 2
- 3 A. Yeah. I mean, I suppose I don't recall who asked me to do
- it but, you know, no. 4
- 5 DX A2, the Victor Tapia labor report --
- Mm-hmm. 6 Α.
- 7 -- do you see what you said is your handwriting on page 13?
- 8 Α. Yes.
- 9 So as of -- does that then reflect that as of October 5,
- 10 2017, \$289.67 was owed to Mr. Tapia?
- 11 A. Let me just read it.
- 12 (Pause)
- 13 Yes. I believe so.
- Q. Now, you say that Mr. Tapia was paid for his hours by 14
- 15 paychecks, is that right?
- 16 Α. Mm-hmm, yes.
- 17 Well -- but the 6 -- what you have written here as the
- 18 June 26 hours, tips paid, the rest of the money that's owed is
- 19 for hours that were worked, right?
- 20 Objection. MR. AVERY:
- 21 THE COURT: I don't think I understand the question.
- 22 Q. Your calculation on page 13 says 158.04 owed, is that
- 23 right?
- 24 A. Yes, .04.
- 25 Plus 131.63, \$289.67 total owed. Is that for hours or for

- 1 tips?
- It's for hours. 2 Α.
- 3 Well, if --Ο.
- It says 6/26 hours and then dash tips paid, meaning the 4 Α.
- 5 tips were paid.
- Q. OK. If it was your job to run payroll as hours were 6
- 7 punched in and punched out for -- well, did you run payroll
- every week or every two weeks? 8
- 9 A. Every week.
- 10 Q. Every week?
- 11 Α. Mm-hmm.
- 12 So how is it then that as of October 5, 2017, \$289.67 for
- 13 hours were still owed to Mr. Tapia?
- 14 A. Because his check was not cashed. It says it above. So if
- 15 we give him a check and he didn't cash it, so ...
- Q. And is there any record that you have that reflects that 16
- that check was issued but not paid -- but not cashed? 17
- A. I don't have that on me but, yes, that's how I got the 18
- information. 19
- 20 What record is that?
- 21 It must have been from our banking records and from
- 22 Paychex.
- 23 So that payroll check, you're saying, would have been
- 24 whatever week -- whatever week payroll was paid for, the 6/26
- 25 hours, correct?

10

- Α. I believe so, yes.
- You didn't oversee the service staff punching in and 2 Q. 3 punching out on a daily basis, did you?
- Yes. I mean, I was there because --4 Α.
- 5 Well, it wasn't your responsibility to see that they 6 punched in and punched out, correct?
- 7 I don't know how to answer that. It was my responsibility to run the payroll, so I had to make sure that I received 8 9 everyone's hours on the labor report, that they had to clock in
- 11 Q. Did you stand there and as employees came in each day, you
- 12 made sure that each employee checked in and checked out; is
- 13 that what you're saying?

and out.

- 14 A. It was their responsibility to clock in when they got to 15 work.
- So the answer is no, is that right? 16
- 17 I don't understand what you're trying to say. I didn't 18 stand there next to the Aloha system for every single employee.
- So the answer is no? 19 Q.
- 20 I suppose so, yes. I did not. Α.
- 21 Q. OK. Thank you.
- 22 In fact, you weren't there beyond 7 on most days, 23 correct? Is that what you said?
- 24 I said that my general hours were 11 to 7, but I was 25 there -- you know, I can't say that I left every day at

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 7 o'clock. I mean, this report I generated says 7:03, so obviously sometimes I was there past 7. I don't know what you are asking me.
 - OK. Do you know -- do you have any personal knowledge as Ο. to whether or not Mr. Tapia worked days that are not reflected in this labor report?
- Everyone -- all the employees knew --
- No. No. Ms. Storino --Q. No.

THE COURT: Hold on one second. you are doing my job now. OK? Let's hear what her answer is. If you think it is nonresponsive, then you move to strike the answer.

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes.

THE COURT: Don't interrupt her while she is answering. Let's see what the answer is.

OK. So now that we've had that colloquy, you probably don't remember the question. So, I will read you the question now.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. "Do you have any personal knowledge as to whether or not Mr. Tapia worked days that are not reflected in this labor report?" That's the question.

Do you have any knowledge? That is a yes-or-no question. Do you have any knowledge one way or the other about whether he worked any hours other than what is on the report? Yes or no? Or if you can't answer yes or no, say why you

can't.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: I'm still not understanding. Do I have any knowledge whether or not he worked days that are not on this report? Is that pretty much what you want to know?

THE COURT: That's the question.

THE WITNESS: I don't have that. I mean, I don't believe that he could have worked any other days besides what's on this report.

> THE COURT: OK. That's your answer.

She doesn't think he could have worked any other days besides what is on this report.

Next question.

BY MS. CONNOLLY:

To your knowledge, was any employee, managerial or one of the owners, responsible for and did check in each employee as they arrived for work to ensure that they punched in?

A. It was -- if someone didn't clock in or out, they would have told the manager who would then tell me. The manager would communicate to me if someone did not clock in or out so that they would be paid. If an employee didn't clock in or out, they would tell someone so that they could get paid. No one came to me ever and said that Victor Tapia was here and did not clock in or out.

MS. CONNOLLY: I move to strike the answer as nonresponsive.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

THE COURT: That motion is denied.

- BY MS. CONNOLLY: 2
- 3 Q. To your knowledge, did anyone -- did any person stand watch 4 over the POS system in the morning to ensure that each employee
- 5 clocked out before they left Space?
 - A. Not to my knowledge someone would stand there in the morning. If they don't clock out, it shows up on the labor report as an 11 a.m. I wrote that down here, a default clock out, 11 a.m. That's is how someone would know.
 - Q. But it wouldn't show up as an 11 a.m. clock out if they didn't punch in, correct?
 - If an employee did not punch in when they arrived at work, there would be no 11 a.m. default clock out, correct? A. Correct. If they did not punch in, then they can't punch out. I don't understand. No. I mean, how is it going to punch them out if they are not punched in?
 - OK. Thank you. Right. 0.
- 18 Α. Sorry.
- 19 There are other people who work on this POS Aloha program, 20 correct?
- 21 Α. Correct.
- 22 Q. And who are those people?
- 23 The manager, I suppose. Α.
- 24 And what about the owners? Ο.
- 25 I've never seen them using it. Α.

Storino - cross

- Do all managers have access to the software program? 1
- I don't know. I didn't -- I wasn't responsible for handing 2 Α.
- 3 out access to people, so I don't know.
- 4 Who was? Q.
- 5 I don't know. I just went and did my job. I generated
- 6 labor report for payroll.
- 7 And who did you report to?
- 8 Α. The owners.
- 9 In particular whom? To both Mr. Geniton and Q.
- 10 Mr. Piacquadio?
- 11 Α. Yes.
- 12 And you are aware that this lawsuit alleges unpaid wages,
- 13 correct?
- 14 Correct, yes. Α.
- 15 Q. And you are aware that Space and the owners have been sued
- at least twice before for --16
- 17 MR. AVERY: Objection.
- 18 Q. -- similar claims, correct?
- THE COURT: Just one second. 19
- 20 First of all, you can't object until the question is
- 21 finish. OK?
- 22 MR. AVERY: Sorry.
- 23 THE COURT: So, now the question is finished.
- 24 MR. AVERY: Objection.
- 25 THE COURT: Sustained.

J5mdtap1 Storino - cross

1 (Pause)

- 2 BY MS. CONNOLLY:
- 3 Q. The POS machine, at times it was blocked from allowing
- 4 people to punch in, correct?
- 5 A. No, not that I'm aware of.
- 6 Q. And there were times when the POS machine was not working,
- 7 | correct?
- 8 A. No, that's not correct.
- 9 Q. Ms. Storino, you are being paid for your testimony here
- 10 | today, correct?
- 11 | A. No, that's not correct.
- 12 | Q. Are you being paid for your time --
- 13 | A. No.
- 14 | Q. -- here today?
- 15 | A. No, I'm not.
- 16 | Q. Were you served with a subpoena?
- 17 | A. No.
- 18 Q. Do you still work for any of the defendants?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 Q. Do you work for any companies associated with the
- 21 defendants?
- 22 A. No.
- 23 | Q. Who contacted you to request your testimony here today?
- 24 A. I'm sorry, I don't know his name, the attorney.
- 25 | THE COURT: It's not Mr. Avery or Ms. Overbeck, one of

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

19

20

Storino - cross

1 the two lawyers who are here?

> MR. AVERY: It was me.

> > THE COURT: I'm sorry?

MR. AVERY: It was me.

THE WITNESS: Yes. I didn't know his name.

MR. AVERY: She didn't know my name.

THE COURT: Oh, she didn't know your name?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: But it was Mr. Avery?

THE WITNESS: Right. He said it was. Yes, it was

him.

12 THE COURT: All right.

13 BY MS. CONNOLLY:

I'm sorry, I asked you this question.

Do you know who has -- who has the ability to grant access to the software program -- those administrative

17 privileges to access the software program?

18 Α. No.

- And who is -- was there a manager named Jennifer?
- There was an employee named Jennifer. Α.
- 21 OK. Was she an Asian lady? Is she an Asian lady? Q.
- 22 I believe so, something like that, yes.
- 23 Ο. OK. Did Mr. Geniton and Mr. Piacquadio ever direct OK.
- 24 you to draw checks outside of the normal course of running
- 25 payroll -- checks to employees outside of the normal course of

- running payroll?
- Α. I don't understand what --
- 3 As a bookkeeper, you wrote checks to pay various expenses
- 4 of the business?
- 5 Α. Yeah.

2

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Did Mr. Geniton and/or Mr. Piacquadio direct you to draw 6
- 7 checks to employees outside of the normal running of payroll?
- Not outside the normal running of payroll, no. 8
- 9 So you never wrote checks to any employees; those were all 10 done through Paychex, is that right?
- A. No, that's not right. I've written checks to employees but 11 12 only when it's for payroll purposes, not outside of the general
- 13 practice of payroll, not just for any old reason.
- 14 Q. So it's not correct that all payroll is run through Paychex? 15
- THE COURT: Well, what circumstances would there be 16 where you would write a check, as opposed to the check to the 17 18 employee coming from Paychex?

THE WITNESS: I'm trying to think of a certain situation if and when that would happen. I suppose if an employee didn't -- no longer worked at the company and if they didn't receive their last check and say for, you know, if they didn't come to us for, you know, maybe they weren't in payroll anymore because I terminate them when they are no longer an employee, but if they, you know, still had one check left, we

Storino - cross

- would write something like that for them, a final wages kind of 1 a check, something like that, you know. 2
- BY MS. CONNOLLY: 3
- 4 If you look at DX -- Defendants' A1, the Victor Tapia 5 earnings report.
- 6 (Counsel conferred)
- 7 MR. AVERY: She doesn't have it.
- MS. CONNOLLY: The marked one? 8
- 9 MR. AVERY: Yes.
- 10 THE COURT: Call it A1.
- 11 MR. AVERY: A1A.
- MS. CONNOLLY: I will write in 1 on here. 12
- 13 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- 14 BY MS. CONNOLLY:
- Ms. Storino, do you recognize this document? 15 Q.
- 16 Α. Yes.
- 17 Can you tell me what it is? Q.
- 18 An employee earning record. Α.
- 19 And who generates this record? Q.
- 20 Α. Paychex.
- 21 Q. Paychex?
- 22 Α. Yes.
- 23 And when do you get -- when do you receive these records?
- 24 When does Space receive these records?
- 25 They are available on our online account and they can be

- generated anytime.
- And how does Paychex get this information that's in here? 2 Q.
- 3 It's showing the checks that were issued through payroll.
- 4 Well, where do they get the input from, the Victor Tapia, Q.
- 5 the --

- 6 That's from -- he's entered into the payroll system by
- 7 myself.
- 8 Ο. OK. And those reports are sent by what? Someone sends
- 9 those reports to Paychex, or that information to Paychex?
- 10 I put that into Paychex when someone -- a new person that's
- 11 going into payroll, I type in their name, social, address, and
- 12 then the payroll, the hours, and then checks are generated.
- 13 And they keep records of everyone, Paychex, that they generate.
- 14 Do you see also here a hire date? Q.
- 15 Α. Yes.
- And what does that date show to be? 16 0.
- 17 Well, I don't know if that is a 6 or an 8. Α.
- 18 Is it month and day? Q.
- 19 Α. Yes.
- 20 August 25, 2016, correct? 0.
- 21 I believe so, yes. Α.
- 22 And if you look back to, well, Tapia labor report. Q.
- 23 Α. Mm-hmm.
- 24 You see that the three dates of employment that are listed Ο.
- 25 on page 12 are August 12, 2016; August 6, 2016, and June 26,

2016? 1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

- 2 Mm-hmm, yes. Α.
- Q. Well, Mr. Tapia wasn't working at Space, according to the 3 earnings record, until August 25, 2016, correct? 4

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I didn't follow that question.

MS. CONNOLLY: D2, page 12, shows three dates that

Mr. Tapia allegedly worked.

THE COURT: The first one of which is June 26, right?

MS. CONNOLLY: June 26, August 6, and then August 12,

2016.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. CONNOLLY: And the earnings report, A1 --

THE COURT: Right.

MS. CONNOLLY: -- the hire date says August 25, 2016.

THE COURT: I thought it was 26th, but, anyway,

August 26th --

MS. CONNOLLY: August 26th or 27th.

THE COURT: OK.

BY MS. CONNOLLY: 19

- Q. So the labor report -- either the labor report or the
- 21 earnings report is incorrect about the dates of Mr. Tapia's
- 22 employment, correct?
- 23 A. So the employee earning record for the hire date is most
- 24 likely -- the default date is when I would have entered him

25 into Paychex.

4

10

12

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

- So he wasn't paid before August 25, 2016?
- It shows the dates that he was paid for on the employee 2 Α. 3 earning record.
 - Well, if he was -- why would he have --0.
- 5 It is automatically -- it is a default date for hire date.
- 6 When I enter someone into Paychex, the date I enter it, it is
- 7 the hire date unless I, you know, correct it, unless I change
- it. But it still shows the correct dates that he was paid for 8 9 at the top.

THE COURT: Can I ask this question?

11 THE WITNESS: Sure.

THE COURT: If we look at the labor report for

13 August 6, 2016, that's for 9.57 hours. Do you see that?

THE WITNESS: Aha, yes.

THE COURT: OK. So he worked August 6 9.57 hours, and then the employee earnings record shows that on September 9th, which covers the 9.57 hours, he was paid. Are you saying there is a correspondence between the August 6th and the

19 September 9th dates?

> THE WITNESS: Yes. That is a check date. So the check date of September 9th, he was paid for the week of 8th -or the date of August 6th.

> THE COURT: And the same would be true with respect to the August 12th date that is listed, the hours being 9.2 hours, and on August 26th, the 9.2 hours are reflected there.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

they were paid then?

THE WITNESS: Correct, right. So the check date of this -- these two check dates is when he was paid for those two dates that he actually worked.

THE COURT: OK. But there is no employee earnings record with respect to the June 26th date?

THE WITNESS: Correct, which is the amount that I had written he was owed on the next page.

THE COURT: OK.

BY MS. CONNOLLY:

- Why would it take you -- why would there be a lag between the time a person starts working and the time you enter him into Paychex?
- A. Well, I mean, from my past experience, you don't get paid the same week that you work at a company. There is always, you know, at least a week or so until you get paid for the previous weeks that you worked. So it could have also been that -- I don't know. I don't want to speculate. I don't know. It could be different reasons. It could be that I was missing, you know, a document of his for something, you know, as part of the payroll application that he has to fill out in the paperwork. It could have been just been something like that, I don't know. But there are different reasons.
- Q. Did you have any responsibility or duties to pay out petty cash to any employees?

- I didn't do that. Α.
- Were you ever directed to make a cash payment to Saul Soto? 2 Q.
- 3 I may have -- yeah, I don't -- I may have paid him cash
- 4 through a manager's, you know, asking me to do that, coming
- 5 from a manager, but not me directly.
- Q. No, not you directly. 6
- 7 And you are aware that Saul Soto wasn't paid for all
- the hours he worked, correct? 8
- 9 MR. AVERY: Objection.
- 10 Α. No.
- 11 THE COURT: Just hold on.
- 12 Sustained.
- 13 MS. CONNOLLY: I have no further questions.
- 14 THE COURT: Any redirect?
- 15 MS. CONNOLLY: I would like to move the first page,
- 16 Al, into evidence.
- 17 THE COURT: Any objection to A1 coming into evidence.
- 18 MR. AVERY: No, your Honor.
- THE COURT: A1 is received into evidence. 19
- 20 (Defendants' Exhibit Al received in evidence)
- 21 THE COURT: Mr. Avery.
- 22 MR. AVERY: Yes. I will be very brief, your Honor.
- 23 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 24 BY MR. AVERY:

25

Defense Exhibit A, the labor report for Tapia, could you

- 1 | take a look at that real quick?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 | Q. Do you see the entry that you were talking about, the
- 4 | 1:17 a.m. default clock out, how many hours are recorded in the
- 5 system with that default clock out on that day? Do you see
- 6 | right under --
- 7 | A. OK, 17.55.
- 8 Q. Right. And then in your handwritten calculations you were
- 9 discussing, how many hours did you use?
- 10 A. Yes. In my calculation I was using the entire amount, the
- 11 | 17.55, even though he did not clock out. So we are still
- 12 paying him for that 17.55 is what I included that he was owed
- 13 || for.
- MR. AVERY: No further questions.
- THE COURT: Anything else?
- MS. CONNOLLY: No, your Honor.
- 17 | THE COURT: All right. Ms. Storino, thank you very
- 18 | much. You are excused.
- 19 THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.
- 20 | THE COURT: Have a good afternoon.
- 21 THE WITNESS: Thank you. You, too.
- 22 (Witness excused)
- 23 THE COURT: We will take a lunch break, but before we
- 24 do, why don't you tell me what is going to happen after lunch?
- MR. AVERY: I think we are going to discuss it, your

J5mdtap1

25

1 Honor. 2 You think you are going to discuss it? THE COURT: 3 MR. AVERY: Yes. 4 THE COURT: Meaning there is some possibility you are 5 not going to have further witnesses? 6 MR. AVERY: It is possible. 7 THE COURT: And there is a possibility you may call one or more of your clients? 8 9 MR. AVERY: That is right. 10 THE COURT: Just trying to understand what is 11 happening. 12 MR. AVERY: Absolutely. 13 The one thing I do want to do after is -- Kerry and I 14 can do this over lunch, the days, just this was a Friday, this 15 was a Saturday, and then we will discuss over the break whether one more witness is needed. 16 17 THE COURT: OK. All right. So we will reconvene at 18 2:15. That should give you enough time to talk and eat, and it is important to eat so make sure you do that. OK? 19 20 All right. We'll see you at 2:15. 21 THE CLERK: All rise. 22 (Luncheon recess) 23 24

1 AFTERNOON SESSION

2:30 p.m.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: OK. What's next?

MR. AVERY: Your Honor, at this point, opposing counsel and I were able to agree on a stipulation as to the dates.

THE COURT: OK. Do you want to read it into the record?

MR. AVERY: Yes, please.

THE COURT: Go right ahead.

MR. AVERY: OK. July 22, 2016 was a Friday. July 30, 2016 was a Saturday. August 5, 2016 was a Friday. August 6, 2016 was a Saturday. August 12, 2016 was a Friday. August 13, 2016 was a Saturday. August 14, 2016 was a Sunday. September 2, 2016 was a Friday. September 13 -- or

September 3rd, sorry, 2016 was a Saturday. September 4, 2016 was a Sunday. September 10, 2016 was a Saturday.

September 23, 2016 was a Friday. October 9, 2016 was a Sunday.

October 21, 2016 was a Friday. October 22, 2016 was a

Saturday. October 29, 2016 was a Saturday. November 4, 2016

was a Friday. November 5, 2016 was a Saturday. November 11,

2016 was a Friday. November 12, 2016 was a Saturday.

December 18, 2016 was a Sunday. That's it.

THE COURT: OK. What's next?

MR. AVERY: And at this time the defense rests, your

Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: So there are no further exhibits that either side wants the Court to be received in evidence?

MR. AVERY: I apologize. There was just one. We, the defense, moves in Defense Exhibit C.

THE COURT: Right. Is there an objection?

MS. CONNOLLY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Exhibit C is received.

(Defendants' Exhibit C received in evidence)

THE COURT: All right. So shall we have closing arguments, then? Would you like to be heard, Ms. Connolly? MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, your Honor.

I think that the evidence has established that Mr. Tapia worked for Eden Ballroom, Defendant Eden Ballroom LLC, at Space for the period July 1, 2016 through January 4, 2017. The defendants' records of three dates of punching in and punching out have not been demonstrated to be accurate or thorough. Mr. Tapia testified that he was oftentimes prevented from punching in and punching out, and defendants' own records, such as they are, show that the start -- his start date was August 25th, when defendants have stipulated in a Pretrial Order that Mr. Tapia's start date at Space was July 1, 2016.

THE COURT: Wait. When you say --

MS. CONNOLLY: August 25th, 2016. Sorry.

THE COURT: I don't quite understand why you say that

because their records say he worked on June 26th. So they would say that was the first date that he worked. So what do you mean by August 25th being the start date? I don't follow that.

MS. CONNOLLY: On Defendants' A1, the hire date is -- Ms. Storino testified that that was the date she put in as his start date.

THE COURT: You are talking about the August 26th date there. That was discussed in terms of when payment was made, not when he started employment.

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, but she testified that that was when she just put him on. She didn't say she knew when he started. She said that was a default date. She didn't --

THE COURT: No. My understanding -- and I was asking her questions about this -- if you look at A and then Al, on A, for the August 12th date, that corresponds to the hours where he worked 9.2 hours, right? And that corresponds on Al with the first date, right? There is a relationship between what they say the labor information is, the timesheets, and the payment. From what her testimony was, this is when there was payments.

Although, as I understood what she was saying -- and some of this was not entirely explained, but she said that he didn't cash one of the checks. He didn't cash the second check, the 155.04 check. She didn't really explain the first

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So it seems to me that what this document shows is check. there is \$227.65 that are owed to him because this was not cashed and this was not explained. That's what this would mean to me, because they say he worked on these three dates.

MR. CONNOLLY: Right.

THE COURT: They say he only worked on these three dates.

MS. CONNOLLY: Right.

THE COURT: So the way I read the evidence to date -and the record is now closed -- is that that money, the \$227.85, is owed to Mr. Tapia. That goes in the what he's owed Tell me why that's wrong.

MS. CONNOLLY: My point that I was making, your Honor, is that on A1, the hire date is stated to be -- and I read it as August 25, 2016, but maybe it is August 26, 2016. Storino said, you know, that was just the date she put him on payroll.

My point is that that is not accurate even according to her own accounting because -- or her -- these records because it says that he punched in on 6/26/2016, and if he was hired on August 25th, 2016, he couldn't have punched in on June 26.

And I hear what you are saying but that's not what she She said that that was just when he was put on -- she said. put his start date in to be put on payroll.

THE COURT: You are using the phrase "start date to be put on payroll," and I don't know that that's what Ms. Storino said Al represents. This is when Paychex cut checks to Mr. Tapia. That's what I understood this to mean.

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes. But the information that was provided to Paychex was provided by Ms. Storino.

THE COURT: Right. Let's be clear. As I understand the record, the June 26th date wasn't paid for --

MS. CONNOLLY: Right.

THE COURT: -- at all. That doesn't mean -- their position can't be that he started on that date but it was only one of three dates that he worked on, because that's what the labor form or record, or however we're characterizing this, reflects. That's their position. That's what they have argued through the witnesses today. Right? And you're arguing that their records of the three dates is inaccurate because they don't correspond to what's been received as Al. And all I'm saying is what is in Al corresponds to two of the three dates from what I understood Ms. Storino to have said.

MS. CONNOLLY: Right.

THE COURT: Tell me why you think that's wrong, if it is.

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, the point is, your Honor, that it demonstrates that their records do not accurately reflect the dates of Mr. Tapia's employment, and it also reflects that the

dates are -- it brings to mind the phrase "garbage in/garbage out." The defendants had control of these records. Mr. Soto testified that he oftentimes was not able to punch in and punch out and that his employment -- the labor reports that related to him were not accurate. There were many entries that made no sense to him for the punching in for periods of 18 minutes, etc.

So, Mr. Soto, who worked a much longer period of time and was supposed to be paid -- he was paid on occasion for his work as a porter, and he was only paid tips when he worked as a barback and busboy. So, even Mr. Soto said the records were unreliable. And Mr. Tapia then testified that he was not able to punch in and punch out.

THE COURT: But to be clear, although this was not really brought out in the testimony and it surprised me that it was not brought out since you called Mr. Soto, Mr. Soto worked during the same period of time, not necessarily the same shift, but the same period of time, at least in part, that Mr. Tapia did, and there are clock entries for all of these dates that you claim Mr. Tapia worked. So, why wouldn't that then be reflected in their records if in fact he worked those days?

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, because the defendants have control of their records. As Mr. Avery elicited from Mr. Soto, the managers, in his -- in Mr. Soto's labor history, the managers had access to -- and Ms. Storino confirmed that the

managers had access to the software processing system. So, only in one of the entries of Mr. Soto's labor report is Morgan McLean --

THE COURT: Yes, I saw that. But are you then arguing effectively that even though Mr. Tapia worked from June to January, that some manager interposed him or herself into these labor reports on every time he worked except for three? That's effectively what I think you are arguing, isn't it?

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, there are records here that have been testified to as being inaccurate. What the defendants did or did not do I am not in personal knowledge of.

THE COURT: They were testified to as being inaccurate by your client who says that they don't include days that he worked. Is that what you mean by that?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, your Honor. And the evidence does show that there were managers — not manager but managers, and perhaps the owners, you know, that have administrative privileges who could go in and change the dates.

THE COURT: But we have in the Soto labor report one instance of that one manager's name being listed. That's the evidence you are talking about in that regard, right? We don't have a labor report for Mr. Tapia where there is any equivalent of that.

MS. CONNOLLY: No, your Honor, because there are three dates, which Mr. Tapia testified he worked six months, and he

1 worke

worked New Year's Eve and he worked Halloween. So for defendants to claim that these reports, which were generated after this litigation was filed --

THE COURT: Right. You are effectively arguing that the labor report that the defendant has provided with respect to Mr. Tapia is a fraud in some way, effectively; that's what you're arguing.

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, I am not using the word "fraud." I'm saying that Mr. Tapia testified that they are inaccurate, the same way that Mr. Soto testified that his records were inaccurate. And if both parties testified that the POS system was blocked or not working on numerous occasions and they were told — the employees were told to write down their time and give it to the office, and Mr. Soto said he doesn't — he didn't see any evidence of that happening.

THE COURT: He didn't see any evidence of what happening?

MS. CONNOLLY: Of the time that he had written down —
THE COURT: Well, again, while it is not entirely
explained because the record lacks a lot of clarity in this
case, with respect to the June 26 date, there is an annotation
by Ms. Storino about him having worked less than what the clock
credited him, although my understanding is the defendant paid
him for the longer period of time for that date. That's what I
think they have argued. Is that not right?

MS. CONNOLLY: That they --

THE COURT: Let's go back to first principles. Your client is allowed to come in here and testify "This is when I think I worked," and that's all he has to do to meet his initial burden. Nothing beyond that.

So far you agree with me, right?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes.

THE COURT: Then the defendant, in responding to that, and meeting, I'll say, its shifting burden, with the ultimate burden always remaining on the plaintiff, can, if it has documents or other evidence, rebut what the witness' best recollection of when he worked is with documentary evidence. In many of these cases, as I know you know because you are experienced in this area, the defendant has no records. OK? In this case, this defendant has records, proffered records. Those records reflect that their records show Mr. Tapia worked on three dates for them and not more than three dates.

So, you're essentially saying the Court should entirely discount these labor reports even though we have labor reports from another former employee, who you called, which reflect a much longer period of time, including many of the weeks that Mr. Tapia says he worked, when he would presumably have said, although the record is a little imprecise, that he wasn't able to punch in during those days or during those weeks — the very days or weeks that we have records in

evidence that Mr. Soto worked. So, how do I reconcile that, then? Why should I entirely discount the records proffered by the defendants in those circumstances?

MS. CONNOLLY: Because, your Honor, these reports can be generated in any way, shape or form. If you instruct the system to generate a report for three days, it can do so. It can --

THE COURT: But you didn't ask -- I'm sorry to interrupt you, but you didn't ask Ms. Storino any questions about that. In other words, you didn't pursue whether she somehow limited, other than the period of time is from when Eden Ballroom first opened in 2014 until October 5, '17, when she ran the report -- that was the period. So my understanding of her testimony was she was told to query the system to find every date that Mr. Tapia worked, and what came out was the labor report that is in evidence as A1, which shows the three dates. That's what she did. That's what her testimony was.

Not that she somehow limited it in some way to make it less than what he really did and that their records show.

How are you meeting your ultimate burden to prove otherwise?

MS. CONNOLLY: By showing that the record, the earnings record, does not match the labor record, and Mr. Tapia specifically testified that this record does not reflect all of the days that he worked --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: But the earnings record only has two dates It doesn't have anything other than those two dates. on it. So what am I supposed to make of that, then? Why should I draw from that inference that he worked six months?

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, the earnings record --

THE COURT: Especially, if you will, when his testimony in his deposition was completely inconsistent with his testimony today and his Amended Complaint. So there are a lot of inconsistencies in Mr. Tapia's own version of when he worked. Sometimes it's 2016 and sometimes it's 2017. Sometimes it's two days a week, sometimes it's three days a That undermines his credibility if he can't get his story straight. His answer was constantly three days, 10 hours; three days, 10 hours. I don't really remember when I started and when I ended. That was really what he was saying, as I heard him.

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, that is what he testified to in his deposition. And even at his deposition he said, you know, I don't really remember. He explained that he hadn't remembered and that it was two years between the time he left the position and the start of his deposition.

THE COURT: So why is what he says today any more believable than what he said in January?

MR. CONNOLLY: Because he refreshed his recollection.

THE COURT: By doing what?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CONNOLLY: By reviewing the records he had provided to me.

THE COURT: What records were those? Nothing that is in evidence in this trial. He didn't, like, have a diary or something that he kept at home.

MS. CONNOLLY: No, he didn't have a diary.

THE COURT: What are we taking about? What records did he review that are before the Court that I can consider to assess the period of time that he worked? What are we talking about?

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, his initial interview, the interview notes with me, that were used in crafting the Complaint.

THE COURT: OK. Well, the Complaint says he worked two days a week.

MS. CONNOLLY: And that's --

THE COURT: Exhibit 1 that you offered and was received in evidence says he worked three days a week. So for inconsistencies like that, why don't that disfavor your position? Inconsistencies undermine credibility.

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, your Honor, I asked Mr. Tapia if he drafted the Complaint and he --

THE COURT: Obviously, he didn't draft the Complaint.

MS. CONNOLLY: Obviously, he didn't draft the Complaint.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: It is as obvious that he didn't draft the complaint as it is that July is not in the winter, my favorite line in today's trial.

MS. CONNOLLY: I kind of, like, you know, December 26 was a Monday, you know.

THE COURT: Well, I don't frankly know why we just had a recitation of when all of those days were, but I'm sure Mr. Avery will enlighten me at some point.

MS. CONNOLLY: Mr. Tapia explained that he didn't -you know, he was paid cash for his tips. He finished working at Space in January 2017. It was two years before his deposition. He testified he wasn't refreshed before his deposition as to the dates of his employment.

THE COURT: He should have been.

MS. CONNOLLY: In the Pretrial Order, defendants have stipulated that Mr. Tapia started working on July 1st, and yet they have him -- they have on his labor report that he punched in on June 26. That doesn't match either. Why did they stipulate to the fact that he started --

THE COURT: The Pretrial Order is not admissible evidence at a trial unless it is a stipulated fact.

MS. CONNOLLY: It is a stipulated fact.

THE COURT: What number are you talking about? What page?

MS. CONNOLLY: Little Roman numeral 12 at page 6.

| OSMACAPZ

THE COURT: OK. I have to see what Mr. Avery says in that regard.

MS. CONNOLLY: Now, at the December 4th hearing,
Mr. Avery represented that he was going to update -- he had to
update their Rule 26 -- Defendants' Rule 26 disclosures by
identifying the Asian woman who hired Mr. Tapia, and defendants
never did that, preventing us from obtaining discovery about
the date of Mr. Tapia's hire.

THE COURT: You never made a motion to compel.

MS. CONNOLLY: No, you are correct.

THE COURT: I mean, I don't know what to do about that at this moment in time. I feel like that ship has sailed.

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, but they were still under an obligation. Mr. Avery represented to the Court and to counsel that that was what he was going to do and he didn't do it.

THE COURT: But you have to seek relief if you are not getting something you feel you need. Obviously, if that's something you felt you needed for trial, that's relief you should have sought from the Court. I would have obviously considered an application at any point during the discovery period, which we extended after we were unable to see whether this matter could get resolved, so.

MS. CONNOLLY: Umm --

THE COURT: And in any event, even if he had identified this woman prior to trial, tell me what bearing that

would have on the trial today.

MS. CONNOLLY: I can't say everything, but we would —it would have been confirmed that there was — in addition to Mr. Tapia's testimony, that he never received any initial notice about his rate of pay and he never received any paystubs.

THE COURT: Well, I don't think there is anything in the record and I don't know how defendants can challenge the fact that Mr. Tapia either got a wage notice or got wage statements because there is nothing in front of me, so I think on those particular claims you will prevail because they are uncontested, unless I missed something, but I heard nothing nor is there any documentary evidence otherwise.

But I think what their position is is if I find in their favor, what that then means is that he worked for three days and so there is a certain penalty both with respect to not having gotten a wage notice and not having gotten a wage statement, that, combined with what else he is owed, still either is less than or close to the \$1,020 that he acknowledged he received. So when all of the math is done, if their version of events is accepted, Mr. Tapia either has been fully paid or will be owed a few hundred dollars, as opposed to your version of events which is, if I accept your version, he worked six months and then he's owed in the thousands of dollars, and that's where the disparity is. But in any event, either way,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

he's going to get penalties for wage notice and wage statement violations because that was uncontested at this trial.

MS. CONNOLLY: OK. Your Honor, so with respect to the records, I don't think that defendants meet their burden of demonstrating that their records are accurate, particularly because -- and the Court is aware of this already, but particularly because the defendants are serial violators of the wage-and-hour laws. There have been at least two other wage-and-hour cases filed in this district against them. in generating these reports that were generated after this case was filed, they could have generated whatever they wanted to. They --

THE COURT: Hold on a second. I am a little confused by this argument.

Is this sort of some kind of, like, prior-bad-act-type argument now? Because they have been sued twice, about which I know nothing of the underlying facts other than there have been other lawsuits, I am supposed to draw certain inferences? That might make sense from a "are you entitled to liquidated damages because they have acted in bad faith because they have been sued twice before," but I don't know what I am supposed to do with that for purposes of deciding whether the documents proffered in this case lack credibility.

> Do you understand the distinction I am making? MS. CONNOLLY: I understand the distinction you are

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

making, your Honor. But what I'm saying is that they are well versed in knowing what they need to produce in order to withstand -- or at trial they wanted to come up with records and they came up with records.

THE COURT: Well, but not to deviate too far from Mr. Tapia's case, but Mr. Soto, unlike Mr. Tapia, they recognized they had a significant record when they generated their labor report with respect to Mr. Soto of the length of time he worked, according to their own records and their own system, which -- and while I am not in their head and they haven't paid, apparently, but that would lead them to be more inclined to try and settle a case brought by Mr. Soto, where their records show that he worked all of these weeks based on all of the computer entries, even if they were inaccurate in part, as Mr. Soto said, relative to Mr. Tapia, where his records don't demonstrate nearly that sort of work history. That's why presumably they decided to take this particular claim to trial, because the records that they generated didn't show that he worked the period of time he claims that he did. Ultimately, I have to figure out whether I should accept Mr. Tapia's testimony that he worked this period of time and entirely discount their records, or the opposite, which is that their records show, in a way that you can't overcome, that he only worked these three days. That's what the Court ultimately has to decide on the record in front of it.

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, Mr. Soto had a much longer record of employment there. So, presumably --

THE COURT: You see, part of your argument is that the computer system didn't work for Mr. Tapia. Well, this question was not entirely answered by the testimony, but one question I have is, well, why did it mostly work for Mr. Soto if it didn't work mostly for Mr. Tapia? Can you explain that?

MR. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, I don't think it has been demonstrated that it worked mostly for Mr. Soto --

THE COURT: Well, if we look at the labor report, though, there are a lot of days that are listed there, right? And he was quibbling with why did I punch in twice and why did it say zero hours, or whatever, and that wasn't entirely explained. But I am not here to calculate Mr. Soto's damages.

But what I'm here to evaluate is whether Mr. Tapia's testimony that the computer system basically never worked cohered with records from Mr. Soto where it looked like it worked and Ms. Storino's testimony where she said, as far as she knew when she managed the system, it worked basically all the time except perhaps nothing is perfect. I'm paraphrasing, but her testimony was that the system worked. And if it didn't, she would know about it because managers would have to report things to her.

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, your Honor, I beg to differ. She did not say that she managed the system. She said that she did

1 | not --

THE COURT: I don't mean managed the system in a technological sense, but her responsibility was to generate these reports and to make sure people were getting paid what they were owed. That she did testify to.

She was in charge of payroll, right?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, your Honor. But in the case of Mr. Tapia, when someone isn't being paid for the hours they work, what's the relevance of these records anyway? They have no --

THE COURT: Where are their records of Mr. Tapia complaining to anybody about him not getting paid? Where are their records about him complaining about the computer system not reflecting his hours? Where is there any testimony from him or anyone to corroborate that he in fact worked there at the same time as someone else? There is nothing in the record about that. So, it is entirely on Mr. Tapia and whatever he testified to, and that's all that's in the record, his testimony and what he remembered. That's it.

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, where in the defendants' records are any complaints or any other records? Defendants produced nothing along those lines.

THE COURT: I mean, they are not going to produce records that don't exist. Like, if an employee doesn't complain about not getting paid, and many employees do complain

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

about not getting paid, they often put it in writing or they often talk to managers, or whatever, but I don't have any information like that in this case in this record.

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, I'm sure the Court has seen plenty of cases where employees don't complain about not getting paid, for a number of reasons.

Of course. They don't want to be THE COURT: retaliated against. I understand that. But, again, the record here is sort of surprisingly bare, in both directions, frankly.

MR. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, but what is a person like Mr. Tapia to do who was paid in cash and has no records? only has his testimony. And defendant comes forth generating reports that are created after the litigation was started just to say, oh, no, no, we only have three days for this guy. That doesn't seem to meet the burden --

THE COURT: Why should I doubt their system? How do I have any evidence in the record to suggest the system was manipulated in some way?

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, there is the record of Mr. Soto's labor report that showed that the one entry that shows that it was editable and was edited by Morgan McClain.

THE COURT: OK. But what shows that anything with respect to Mr. Tapia was edited or deleted?

MS. CONNOLLY: Mr. Tapia's testimony.

THE COURT: Well, he didn't testify that his labor

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

report was modified in some way or --

MR. CONNOLLY: But he doesn't have that knowledge. just said that it didn't reflect --

THE COURT: I'm not blaming him. There is no way that he could know one way or the other.

But I don't understand why I should entirely discount this labor report for Mr. Tapia. What basis do I have to discount it?

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, as I said, I have the testimony of Mr. Soto and the testimony of Mr. Tapia. And Ms. Storino, the fact is she said that -- I mean, the start date does not line up. I know you're saying that he wasn't paid for 6/26. But if they can't accurately account for when their employees were hired, they did not produce -- they did not have Jennifer, we think is the name of the Asian lady, testify.

> THE COURT: What would she be testifying to? MS. CONNOLLY: Well, that the start date was or was

not August 25th that they had --

THE COURT: She would have to ask Ms. Storino to find out when the start date was. I wouldn't think she would have something like that committed to memory or have any records other than getting payroll records to reflect that. No?

MS. CONNOLLY: Mr. Tapia testified that he filled out a form the day he was hired, that he put down his name and --

THE COURT: Right. We don't have that in the record,

right?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CONNOLLY: No, it wasn't produced.

THE COURT: Right, which is why you will prevail on the wage notice and the wage statement claim. The question is do you prevail on it for three dates or for six months?

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, I don't want to engage in unattenuated argument with you on this --

THE COURT: That's what we are doing. That's what we should be doing.

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, I don't think that these employer's records are sufficient to rebut the testimony of Mr. Tapia.

THE COURT: OK.

MS. CONNOLLY: And Mr. Soto.

THE COURT: OK. Can I ask you, on your spread-of-hours claim, your Exhibit 1 that has been received in evidence says that Mr. Tapia worked 10 hours a day three days a week, correct?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes.

THE COURT: Why is he entitled to spread of hours, then? Because spread of hours is in excess of 10 hours, as a matter of law, and I have researched it.

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, if you have researched it, I --

THE COURT: It is not 10 hours; it's more than 10

hours.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor.

THE COURT: By your own admission, he worked 10 hours. So even if I credit that, I don't think you have a spread-of-hours claim. Tell me if that's wrong.

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, I would not have included it if I knew it to be 10.01 hours. It was my understanding -and if I am incorrect, I apologize -- I thought that it was --10 hours was the cutoff point on that.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. CONNOLLY: And just give me a moment.

(Pause)

I think that between the Pretrial Order stipulations of fact, we've established coverage under the FLSA. I think that the testimony has established that -- and the Court taking judicial notice of the two prior wage-and-hour cases, if the Court needs the citations, I have them.

THE COURT: You are asking me to take judicial notice of the prior lawsuits?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, your Honor, on the basis of --

THE COURT: Is that in any of the pretrial

submissions?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes.

THE COURT: For me to do that?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes. In the proposed Findings of Fact

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and Conclusions of Law.

THE COURT: That you requested the Court to take judicial notice of the prior lawsuits?

MS. CONNOLLY: Sorry, not that you take judicial notice, just that there was a finding -- on the proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, on paragraph 13.

THE COURT: This is of your submission?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes.

(Pause)

THE COURT: OK. And to what end?

MS. CONNOLLY: To demonstrate that the violations of the wage-and-hour laws were not made in good faith.

THE COURT: OK. By the way, what evidence is there in the record at trial that any of the three individually named defendants should be held liable here?

MS. CONNOLLY: Just that they ran the business. were at Space. They were at the Space space when it was open and operating, and they had the power to hire and fire people.

THE COURT: Who testified to that?

MS. CONNOLLY: That -- Mr. Soto testified to that.

THE COURT: That what?

MS. CONNOLLY: That the owners could hire and fire --

THE COURT: The way I remember his testimony is that when he went to bat for this older employee who eventually got paid, a bouncer told Mr. Soto, because one of the individual

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

defendants told the bouncer to tell Mr. Soto, he shouldn't come back to work. That's what he testified to, isn't that right? He didn't testify that he interacted directly with either of the individual defendants who are present here today.

MS. CONNOLLY: Not in that context, but he said that he interacted with them all the time --

THE COURT: Yes. But he didn't testify that they hired him. He didn't testify that they set his employment terms. He didn't testify that he negotiated with either of them, or anything along those lines. Nor did Mr. Tapia. And forget Mr. Soto, because we're talking about Mr. Tapia's claims.

What did Mr. Tapia testify to with respect to Mr. Geniton, Mr. Seneca, Mr. Mundo and Mr. Piacquadio? MS. CONNOLLY: Mr. Mundo is no longer a defendant.

THE COURT: I'm just reading the caption. mean to say it. Mr. Geniton and the other two, Mr. Seneca and Mr. Piacquadio.

MS. CONNOLLY: We are speaking about Mr. Tapia's claims, but I just want to refer back to Mr. Soto's testimony because he did say that he interacted a lot with Mr. Piacquadio and with Mr. Geniton on not getting paid and wanting to get paid.

THE COURT: OK. What does that have to do with Mr. Tapia?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CONNOLLY: It demonstrates that those two owners had the power to control the purse strings and determine whether or not someone was going to get paid and when they were going to get paid. And Mr. Tapia testified that he met with Mr. Geniton in connection with the \$1,020 payment that was made.

THE COURT: Right. I think he said that is the only time he ever met him.

MS. CONNOLLY: No. Mr. Tapia said that he knew who they were, but even Mr. Tapia said he didn't interact with them, it was mostly the managers.

> THE COURT: Right. OK.

MS. CONNOLLY: OK. Just in terms of the time records, both Mr. Soto and Mr. Tapia testified that when they were not able to punch in, they were told to write out their hours on a handwritten piece of paper. Ms. Storino -- Mr. Soto said that there was a sheet that was maintained for that purpose, and Mr. Tapia said that they were told to put it on a piece of paper. No records of that were ever produced. So, the records that defendants did produce are not complete.

THE COURT: What should have been produced that wasn't produced in that regard?

MS. CONNOLLY: Any handwritten notations made by Mr. Soto or Mr. Tapia about the hours that they worked.

THE COURT: Well, you are assuming they exist, which

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

assumes that what they say is truthful about preparing such documents, right?

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, there was no -- that evidence has not been rebutted.

THE COURT: Well, it's been rebutted to the extent that the labor reports with respect to Mr. Tapia reflect that he worked three days. And if he worked three days and they have that in their system, what other notes would he have written? You're saying he would have written notes for the other five months and three weeks other than the three days he worked, or whatever? I'm not following you.

MS. CONNOLLY: Both Mr. Soto and Mr. Tapia testified that they were told to write down their hours when they were not able to punch in and out and that they gave this information to management. They don't have a record of it. Defendants haven't produced it. Defendants' records are incomplete.

THE COURT: I have an odd question that just came to me and it is not in the record, but does your client go by any name other than Victor Tapia?

MS. CONNOLLY: No, I don't believe so, because we've looked at that other Tapia --

THE COURT: Because I am trying to understand why these labor reports wouldn't have generated more information about Mr. Tapia. I don't understand why they wouldn't have

done that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, your Honor, they didn't pay him. They didn't pay him for the hours he worked. They only paid him in tips. So, they could put whatever they want in those records. They didn't provide a copy of these records to Mr. Tapia on a weekly basis in which he could say, no, this isn't correct, no, this isn't correct.

THE COURT: So he worked for six month without getting paid?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, as did Mr. Soto.

THE COURT: Why would anybody do that?

MR. CONNOLLY: Because --

THE COURT: You would go to work somewhere else if you are not getting paid, and you might go to a lawyer and try and get your money for what you are owed. But why would you not get paid for six months? That is a long time.

MS. CONNOLLY: Because you get paid tips and because you maybe don't understand your recourse, and once you do understand your recourse you file suit.

THE COURT: So your position is he was getting paid throughout this period but only tips?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes.

THE COURT: So he did get tips throughout the entire period?

> MS. CONNOLLY: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: OK. We don't know how much.

MS. CONNOLLY: No.

THE COURT: OK.

MS. CONNOLLY: And defendants, if they acted as good employers should, if they wanted to, you know, take advantage of the tip credit, they needed to record the amount of tips.

THE COURT: Absolutely. They did not comply with the tip credit rules and they violated New York Labor Law. is no question about that. But I don't know what the consequences of that are for this case, because we then still go back to how many hours did he work and how many days did he work.

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, but, your Honor, so the cumulative effect of defendants' failure to keep any records about the tips, any records about -- tax records, they didn't pay, you know, taxes on anything. We don't know what they did as far as taxes are concerned. So, it doesn't seem to me, with their cumulative failures, why their labor reports, which they can manipulate, should be able to overcome Mr. Tapia and Mr. Soto's testimony that the machine just didn't work.

THE COURT: But when you say they can manipulate, what is the evidence in the record to suggest that they did manipulate, the records with respect to Mr. Tapia? That's what I'm struggling with.

I'm not suggesting that he didn't work the period of

1 time v

time you are saying he did, but we're not operating under, you know, on a blank slate here. It is not like there is nothing responding to this on the other side. What you're suggesting is what the defendants have proffered is inaccurate at best, or deceptive at worst, because it was manipulated. But as to the latter, you didn't cross-examine Ms. Storino in a way to suggest that those documents that she herself generated were "manipulated," to use that pejorative word.

What did she testify to to suggest that they were manipulated? She said — she testified that she was asked to run a labor report for Victor Tapia to see what days he worked, and this is what was produced as a result of that inquiry. That was her testimony, right? So what basis does the Court have to question that testimony? Because, effectively, you're suggesting Ms. Storino was not telling the truth. She doesn't work for them anymore. So, it is not like she has an incentive to tell the truth for them, necessarily.

Give me some reason why I should doubt her testimony.

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, your Honor, this report was not something that was generated at the end of Mr. Tapia's employment in January 2017. It was generated well after this litigation and well after the two other cases were filed against the defendants.

THE COURT: Right. Because any defendant would want to understand what their exposure is, right, and what their

defense is going to be able to be. So when they looked at Mr. Soto and they say give us the labor report for Mr. Soto, they get this lengthy sheet. And they think, oh, well, this guy worked here a lot, let's figure out the math, what is his settlement demand, whatever, does it make economic sense to try and work it out. They decided that it did, for whatever reason, although apparently they are in breach of the agreement, but we're dealing with that separately.

With respect to Mr. Tapia, after they are sued and he is the named plaintiff, they asked the person in charge of payroll tell us how many days he worked, and they get the report. And it is three days, and they think, oh, well, three days, plus we had this deal with him where we paid a thousand dollars, and you would want that to look like they were trying to pay him off. But even if they were trying to pay him off doesn't prevent him from pursuing this claim. And we had discussion in a telephone conference a few weeks ago, and all essentially Mr. Avery said in that regard — and I have heard nothing different today — is effectively they should get credit for that but it don't foreclose his claim. So, that is where that is in that regard.

So, I'm just struggling. Believe me, I'm sympathetic to anyone who comes in and says I think I worked this period of time and I disagree with what their records show, but I have to have more than that, I think, just to completely discount the

records that have been produced. They count for something unless there is something infirm about them.

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, your Honor, I think that with Mr. Soto's testimony and with Mr. Tapia's testimony saying that they are not correct and the discrepancy on the start date and the fact that they were generated well after this litigation was filed and with the defendants' very clever little end run trying to pay off -- pick off the plaintiffs, which they picked off -- two of them, apparently, the ones who are in the wind, it's very clear -- and the fact that they signed a settlement agreement and never even -- they were supposed to deliver a post-dated check, they never even did that -- I think that there can be an inference of dishonesty and bad faith and fraud.

Ms. Storino, we don't know -- she said that the managers had access -- administrative privileges to access the labor records. We don't know about the owners, but the owners could have directed any of the managers to change the records. So, Ms. Storino goes in and runs a labor report that has only three days because everything else has been deleted. We don't know that. But we do know that there is testimony that they are not accurate records. And that we do know. And I think that is sufficient to not shift the burden back to plaintiff on the days of his employment.

You were here. You know what we had to do to bring

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Tapia back. He did not understand exactly what he was owed. And once he realized that, he came here, he testified in front of the Court about his dates of employment. He testified that he wanted to go on with the case.

We haven't heard testimony from defendants. It is not likely that someone is going to perjure himself in front of a federal judge.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MS. CONNOLLY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. Thank you.

Mr. Avery.

Thank you, your Honor. I will try to be MR. AVERY: brief.

THE COURT: You don't have to be brief. Ms. Connolly wasn't in part because I kept her up there for a long time.

MR. AVERY: No, I understand. I wanted to --

THE COURT: You want to get off as soon as you can so I don't ask you one question?

MR. AVERY: No. No, no, no. I actually wanted to answer the question I think everyone was curious about why I read that list of dates. And the reason why it is important is because your Honor's understanding of the evidence and testimony as to the machines not working after the first three days of employment, and that's really the only basis for why there are no punches that he offered in his testimony, those

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

dates, according to his testimony that he worked Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays, are not only during the same time period but they are actually on the same day that he claimed to be working and there is no entry for him.

In fact, the record will show -- and I am not going to go through each one of them, just a few right away -- that at the same time he claims to be working, the machine was actually working for Mr. Soto on the same day at the same time. instance, Mr. Soto punched in on 7/22/2016 at 2:03 p.m. and then punched out at 8:51. Plaintiff testified that his shift started at 8 p.m. So, I'm not sure how the machine would have shut off, shut on, and shut back off again just to count Mr. Soto's time.

THE COURT: I think what Ms. Connolly is arguing is that at one point the labor report might have reflected that on 7/22 Mr. Tapia punched in and it was in some fashion deleted or manipulated, or something along those lines, because the report wasn't generated until after the lawsuit was filed and it would have been the third lawsuit the defendants were facing. So, an adverse inference effectively should be drawn against them for their bad faith. And why should I doubt that they wouldn't do that, especially the same defendants who are trying to pick off plaintiffs by paying them outside the process. That's in part what she is arguing.

MR. AVERY: Absolutely. And I was going to get to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that next. I just wanted to do the first part.

Because your point is the dates that THE COURT: OK. you just listed correspond to dates we know Mr. Soto worked in which the system worked. So, if Mr. Tapia was working those same dates which he says he was, the system was plainly working because there is a record for Mr. Soto.

MR. AVERY: Exactly, your Honor, and the list was numerous.

> THE COURT: OK.

MR. AVERY: And as to sort of the latter argument, I think a couple of things need to be drawn out here. One, there actually is no evidence, or testimony, that any of Mr. Tapia's records were manipulated. In fact, I actually think the point that opposing counsel has made with respect to the notation on Mr. Soto's support defendants' position and here's why. only inference that can be drawn from what has been submitted is that when there is a change made, there is a notation under where it specifically says "edited by." There is no "edit by" on Mr. Tapia's record anywhere. It's not as though there are three dates listed and then a series of blank columns with "edited by" and go what happened on these dates. There is also no testimony or evidence that anybody actually went into the system for him at all.

The only evidence regarding any type of change by somebody other than the individual using the time system is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Soto on a single occasion, and it is in fact displayed prominently on the records that we produced. If we were trying to hide that fact, why would defendants produce that evidence?

And I actually think, more importantly, her suggestion that we ran the report after the lawsuit was filed so therefore it must have been changed, it's nonsensical, and the reason is because the other report that was run after the lawsuit was filed was Mr. Soto's. We produced, as your Honor noted, records that were also generated on the same day after the lawsuit was filed showing how extensively he worked, and that was before Mr. Soto had resolved his case.

So when we were looking -- when the defendants are sued and asked their payroll -- office manager, I apologize, to run a report, she testified she provided the report and she has two reports, and that's what happened. And she gave them and then we produced them. There is actually no evidence or testimony that anything happened.

What we are talking about is speculation largely based on the fact that they have been sued on previous occasions, and there is no evidence or testimony in the record that there was any sort of adverse finding in those matters. So the fact that they were litigants in other matters isn't sufficient to just throw away the standards of evidence, throw away the payroll records, and then rely solely on plaintiff's testimony in this case, which was riddled with inconsistencies and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

inconsistencies on not small things.

So, for instance, one of the things that plaintiff's counsel has said was he was confused in his deposition as to when he started and when he ended, the year. Assuming that's true, she is saying that that was a minor mistake and that he didn't intend to mislead anybody, really just got the years mixed up. One thing that's notable is the difference between the winter of 2017 and the summer of 2018 is three times the length of his employment that he just testified to today and that was in his Amended Complaint. That duration of employment is significantly longer than he even testified today.

THE COURT: What do you mean, summer of 2018? You didn't mean 2018.

MR. AVERY: No, I did. That's what he testified. Winter of 2017 to summer of 2018, a year and a half.

> He testified to that when? THE COURT:

In his deposition, right, and that was the MR. AVERY: point that I was going through.

THE COURT: All right. Yes.

Additionally, so not just the length of MR. AVERY: his employment, the days he worked, and as your Honor noted, he initially said it was two. Then by the time it got to trial, it was three days a week.

Even the hours he worked, he's given three different answers. In one, he alleged in the Complaint -- let me just

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

bring it up -- he alleges that he worked from 8 p.m. to 9 a.m., which is 13 hours. And then he testified today that he worked from 8 p.m. to 7 a.m., which is actually 11 hours. And then he submitted a document which he then said was accurate as to his hours, which said he worked exactly 10 hours. So far, that means the hours he's working, the days he's working and the duration of his employment he's given inconsistent testimony on on multiple occasions.

THE COURT: Do you agree with me that your clients have failed to produce any evidence to show they provided either a wage notice or a wage statement?

MR. AVERY: I agree 100 percent on the wage notice. On the wage statement, there actually is a defense that says if he was paid correctly, then there is no wage statement violation. But I believe that would be -- I am just trying to think of it. We are talking about a \$750 maximum fine on that, in any event.

THE COURT: But, also, there is a provision of law that Ms. Connolly cites which talks about the timing of one's payment, and by your witness' own account he was paid weeks after he worked, which is not what New York Labor Law sanctions. So, that would be a problem even in the circumstance, wouldn't it?

MR. AVERY: Yes. Actually -- and this is just because I have a number of these cases -- the frequency-of-pay

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

provision, which is New York Labor Law 196.1, is enforced by the Commissioner. In fact, the text of that statute says that in the event that the Commissioner finds that they were not paid on a weakly basis for employees that Mr. Tapia would qualify as, so nonclerical employees, then there could be a fine assessed by the Commissioner. It would be our position that two things: One, that that's not a civil -- there is not a civil remedy for that, because the fines don't go to the plaintiff, they actually go to the Department of Labor. extent there is actually a claim for a frequency-of-pay violation, the claim would essentially be the interest owed on the late payment when it is actually paid.

THE COURT: All right. Another question I have for you is the \$1,020 that was paid, how was that amount calculated and what is that based on? Is it random or something else?

MR. AVERY: No, I don't think it was random. it was plaintiff has filed a suit. How much is he owed? looks like he's owed roughly I think \$300 or, if that's rounding up, double it. That's liquidated. Now, just to be safe, if our -- if there is interest or there is a notice-of-pay violation, add a couple of hundred. It was just to ensure that there was a maximum amount of relief, that he wasn't owed anything else.

THE COURT: What about the amount of the check that was never cashed, how was that calculated?

1 MR. AVERY: Which check, your Honor? 2 (Pause) 3 Right. So that's for the roughly 10 hours, the 9.57 4 hours. 5 THE COURT: OK. MR. AVERY: That's how that was calculated. 6 7 THE COURT: Well, the June 26 date, right, if you pay him for the 17.55 hours by going past when he should have 8 9 clocked out but didn't --10 MR. AVERY: Right. THE COURT: -- so that -- if we add the 17.5 hours 11 12 plus the 9.2 plus the 9.5, the three days you say he worked --13 Right? 14 MR. AVERY: Right. 15 THE COURT: -- that's 36.32 hours is what you say he should have been paid for, right? 16 17 MR. AVERY: Right. I think that is on there. 18 THE COURT: And I am going to not give you credit for the tip credit because there is nothing in writing and nothing 19 20 in the record to suggest that he was given written notice of 21 that, which means he should get a full \$9 per hour, right? 22 MR. AVERY: Correct. 23 THE COURT: Under New York Labor Law. So that would 24 be \$9 times the 36 hours, which would be \$327, rounded up. OK.

And on that particular day, he would get a spread-of-hours

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

claim because it was more than 10 hours, so that is another \$9. Right?

Then we have the statutory violations. So we have notice of \$150, which is 50 times three days -- this is assuming you are right, OK -- and unless you are right about the law you just said, which I am unfamiliar with, he would get \$750 for not getting a wage statement. So, that total would be \$1,235, right?

Now, you, I think, would argue that there should be a deduction from that of 1,020, right? Should there be some other deduction? I don't know what there should be if the record shows that the \$227 was never paid. Right?

MR. AVERY: The one thing I will say is -- and perhaps this is because the way I answered the question on the wage statement and saying sort of the amount we are talking about is small, I believe, unless I am mistaken, that the penalty for the wage statement is it's the same -- it mirrors the notice.

THE COURT: It doesn't.

MR. AVERY: It is 250?

THE COURT: It is 250 a day, not 150 a day.

MR. AVERY: All right.

THE COURT: So that's how I'm doing the math if I see this case your way. So, but there is no evidence that the 227.65, your Exhibit A number, Ms. Storino said that was not cash, so he didn't receive that. So, even by your analysis, he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is still owed some money. Am I wrong?

There is one check he did not cash MR. AVERY: Yeah. but the other one he did cash.

THE COURT: What is the evidence of that? Where is the check?

MR. AVERY: The check date --

THE COURT: What are we looking at now?

MR. AVERY: Sorry. Al. There are two separate checks, 8/26 and 9/9. The 9/9 is the 957, because that is the one that actually your Honor was asking about to match up to the 957 check that wasn't cashed.

> THE COURT: Right.

MR. AVERY: The other check --

THE COURT: The other one wasn't explained.

MR. AVERY: Right. There is also no evidence or testimony that it bounced or wasn't cashed. In fact, your Honor, what plaintiff did testify to, although he initially said he did not receive a paycheck, he actually testified that he received -- on impeachment, he had in fact received a paycheck for the hours reflected on this exhibit. What I suspect he was saying was I received one check for those hours, and in reality there should have been actually two more checks. One was sent but wasn't cashed.

THE COURT: So it shouldn't be the 227, we should subtract the 69, or whatever it is.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. AVERY: Right. I am just trying to get the exact Let me find that. It's 69 -- so, 69 plus 679, total amount. earnings 7579. That would be subtracted.

> OK. All right. Go ahead. THE COURT:

(Pause)

And, actually, because we just sort MR. AVERY: OK. of touched upon one of the other inconsistencies, which is essentially whether or not he received a check, in addition there were other inconsistencies that weren't explained away by simple yes-or-no questions to a different answer. For instance, for the very reason he brought this lawsuit, in his deposition he actually gave a long answer that he felt that it was unfair for those guys to give him that money and basically hoodwink him because he was owed more, and so then he retained a lawyer and then he filed suit. Except after that, when he realized that he had filed suit six months before that even occurred, he changed his testimony today to the reason that that actually didn't happen. That whole thing was wrong. whole narrative was wrong.

That's not a simple mix-up. That is just a story that he told. There is no evidence, at all, that the clock wasn't working.

THE COURT: The evidence is his testimony and Mr. Soto's that it didn't work some or most of the time is what they said in varying degrees.

MR. AVERY: And first I will start with Mr. Soto because I think it is more significant. Mr. Soto's time records, and which are in evidence and your Honor can evaluate, are not limited to a certain period of time with giant breaks of employment. There are months where he just punches in and out every day except for maybe one. So, he is working six days a week. That's why his time records show there are weeks when he was working 60/70 hours. So I'm not even sure when in theory the time clock would be off.

If he punched in and out on Saturday and Sunday and Monday and Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and presumably what the suggestion would be is the time clock wasn't working the one day he did punch in, or he just only worked that many days, there is no evidence that it actually wasn't working at all, especially during that time period.

And the other thing that I think is important, had Mr. Soto or had Mr. Tapia -- let's stick with Soto first because of the time clock not working -- had he said, look, I know exactly when it stopped working, or about when it stopped working, it was around Halloween of that year it stopped working and it went out for two months and I submitted a bunch of slips and I don't think I was ever paid, then we could match up and say, oh, there is a gap of time on your employment records. He looks at his employment records, which show him clocking in and out virtually every day of the year, and then

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

goes I don't think they are right because I think I -- I don't understand the punch times. In fact, some of the punch times are more advantageous to him than he testified his shift was. They show him working until 11 a.m. at one point or 10:30 at one point or 7:30 at one point in the morning and starting at 11 a.m. There would be no reason for us to fraudulently, like, inflate his records after he sued us to show that we have more liability. It makes no sense.

And I understand that the plaintiff has testified the machine wasn't working, but he also didn't testify -- for instance, had he testified there was something specific to me that they said you can't use the machine, you're off the books, that would be different. That's not what he said. What he said was the machine was not functional on the very days which the records show it was functional.

So, his testimony just simply isn't credible in light of the evidence. And I think that your Honor's understanding of the defendants' position is accurate. He's owed the money essentially which is what's set forth in his letter, and then if you add in this sort of notice-and-wage statement fees on top of that, he was paid more than he was entitled to or within, let's say, a hundred dollars, because, to be honest, I didn't do the math after the last 75 just while we are up here, and at that point there is no viable cause of action anymore. At best, it is a "you were paid late," and he was.

In fact, that claim hasn't even been pled. There is no claim right now under New York Labor Law 196 for interest between I guess when it would be due, which would be September 9th, 2016 until November of 2017, or when he said he signed it, which is December of 2017. That's what we are talking about, not that he worked six months for three days a week.

And then I think, lastly, your Honor — actually, two more points. One is Ms. Connolly said during her closing that we have never produced any of these slips for Tapia. Except one thing Devlyn did testify to was that she did not receive a slip from Tapia. I didn't ask her about Soto and nobody else did. But that evidence and testimony is in the record, that she had not received any slips for him. There was nothing to produce. We are not hiding anything.

And then, finally, I think that there has been virtually no evidence that any of the individuals qualified as Mr. Tapia's employer under the law, and so the claims against them should be dismissed. In fact, Mr. Tapia said he was hired by a woman who was Asian and whose first name was revealed today for the first time, Jennifer, and because he couldn't state her name during her deposition and couldn't explain anything else about that, we had no idea who he was talking about.

And he said he was hired by an individual, Jennifer,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

who is not an individual defendant. He said that a busboy set his schedules, who is not an individual defendant. offered no evidence or testimony that any of the individual defendants actually had anything to do with his employment except for a post-employment what I would call attempt to resolve the litigation in which they are named individual defendants. If that were enough to trigger employer liability, that would mean that everybody that essentially offers a settlement offer after being sued individually is now an employer because they've offered compensation. There is no law to suggest that.

And with that I rest.

THE COURT: Ms. Connolly, you get the last word.

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, Mr. Avery mischaracterized Mr. Tapia's testimony in several ways. Most importantly, he said that Mr. Tapia testified at his deposition that he worked from 2000 -- one-and-a-half years. No, he didn't. No, he didn't. He said that he -- he first said that he believed he was hired in the fall of -- the winter of 2017, and then it was Mr. Avery who said, on page 36, "Would you like to correct your prior testimony as to the years in which you were employed?"

"Yes, because I worked in 2017."

Then Mr. Avery said: "When I asked you before when you started employment, you said the winter of 2017 and it continued until 2018. Was it actually 2016 to 2017?"

Rebuttal - Ms. Connolly Mr. Tapia said: "I think so. I don't remember but I 1 believe so." 2 3 There is no testimony by Mr. Tapia that it continued 4 until 2018. THE COURT: In any event, none of that was in the 5 record of the trial today. The section you are reading from 6 7 now I don't believe was in the record today. MS. CONNOLLY: All right. Mr. Avery is just 8 9 continually saying that Mr. Tapia's testimony was inconsistent. 10 Mr. Tapia testified that, you know, he was mistaken, he didn't 11 remember. And he's testified consistently as to when he was 12 employed. 13 Defendants' entire case now is resting --14 THE COURT: I'm sorry to interrupt you, but what was in the record was on page 9, I believe, where he says -- he's 15 "Do you recall the year in which you started working 16 17 for Eden Ballroom?" He says, "2017, I believe." 18 19 "Do you recall if it was the summer, fall, spring, 20 winter? 21 "It was in winter.

"Do you recall the month?

"Not exactly.

22

23

24

25

"Did your employment with Eden Ballroom ultimately come top an end?

∥ J5mdtap2

"Yes.

"When did it end?

I believe it ended in 2018."

That's what he testified to.

And then he said on the top of the next page:

"Do you recall the month or season of 2018?

"The month I don't remember, but it was in the

summer."

So, Mr. Avery's point is what he testified in his deposition is he started in 2017, not 2016, and he says he ended in the summer of 2018, when he now says he ended in the winter of 2017. So the difference between the winter of 2017 and the summer of 2018 is, as he said in his closing remarks, a year and a half, and that is consistent with what Mr. Tapia said, albeit that he tried to renege that in his testimony at trial by saying he didn't remember and that wasn't accurate.

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, your Honor, actually, he never said that he worked one-and-a-half years. I can see that that would be the conclusion. One would say if that were the case, that he ended in the summer of --

THE COURT: He was wildly inconsistent in his deposition testimony vis-a-vis what was pled in his Complaint, which, as a matter of law, can be considered an admission.

Combined with his trial testimony, they were inconsistent.

There is no two ways around that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CONNOLLY: But Mr. Avery himself later in Mr. Tapia's deposition elicited testimony that: Yes. Oh, you know what, you're right. Those were the dates of my employment. I was wrong. I did not remember.

THE COURT: That is not in the record of the trial. So it doesn't matter what happened in a deposition. I look at a trial record and only a trial record.

MS. CONNOLLY: Well --

THE COURT: His testimony that you are talking about was not offered, and you couldn't offer it because it would be hearsay.

MS. CONNOLLY: OK. Defendants have nothing to say about their stipulation that Mr. Tapia's employment in the pretrial record -- Pretrial Order, that his employment began in July of 2017. They rest their entire defense on a comparison of Mr. Soto's records to Mr. Tapia's records. Mr. Soto himself --

THE COURT: Mr. Tapia testified that the records, the labor reports, don't reflect when he worked. He says he worked on the days that Mr. Soto worked, for which there is a computer entry. The record doesn't explain why there would be a computer entry for Mr. Soto and not one for Mr. Tapia unless the inference to be drawn is the logical one, which is that Mr. Tapia didn't work that day. That's the argument.

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, there was also --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: You have to tell me why I shouldn't draw that inference and why that would be illogical to draw that inference.

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, your Honor, there are a couple of things here. One is that the testimony is that there were times -- at different times of the day the machine was blocked from allowing people to sign in.

THE COURT: So I should draw from the record that at the time Mr. Soto commenced work he could enter his employee ID number into the system but by the time Mr. Tapia was arriving at work to enter, he could not, and the record supports that inference? Is that what I should draw?

MR. CONNOLLY: That's --

THE COURT: What is the basis for that?

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, your Honor, Mr. Soto worked different shifts than Mr. Tapia. When he worked as a porter, he worked -- he worked different hours. So, if he punched in --

THE COURT: The same days, though. We've just -- are you quibbling with the dates that Mr. Avery just identified that are in both records, your Exhibit 1 and their Exhibit D?

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, there has been no testimony that the records of Mr. Soto are accurate with respect to the dates that he worked. All we know is that Mr. Soto said that these are not accurate. So they're trying to show, well, he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

worked on the same dates that Mr. Tapia claimed that he worked, but there is no testimony about that.

THE COURT: Ms. Storino's testimony, it seems to me, confirms the accuracy of the records from her understanding of having generated them.

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, your Honor, but she did not input that data.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. CONNOLLY: There is no testimony by anybody as to the accuracy of the base data. So if there is no --

THE COURT: In other words, your position is that unless the defendants had called the actual person who inputted the time periods into the computer system, the accuracy of those records should be questioned?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, because the defendant -- sorry, Mr. Soto testified that they were inaccurate. If they wanted those records -- if they wanted proof that those records were accurate, they should have asked Mr. Soto if he punched in that day at that time and punched out at that time. Somebody else -- who knows --

> THE COURT: How could someone possibly remember that? MS. CONNOLLY: Well, maybe he has records.

THE COURT: What time did you go to work last week on Tuesday? Do you remember what time you got there -- last Tuesday?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CONNOLLY: 10 o'clock.

THE COURT: Exactly?

MS. CONNOLLY: No. I'm estimating, your Honor.

THE COURT: Right. Exactly. I mean, if you asked me a week ago what time did I get to the courthouse, I'm not sure I could tell you with precision. I could give you an estimate.

MS. CONNOLLY: But the same thing is true with Mr. Soto. Mr. Soto knows the days that he worked. He worked -- he could have testified, yes, well, for this period of time, this is what I did. I was in and I was out. So maybe this is right, maybe this 18-minute --

THE COURT: I am worried less about Mr. Soto.

MS. CONNOLLY: Right.

THE COURT: I'm really concerned about Mr. Tapia, whose claim we're dealing with.

Mr. Tapia, who said reflexively three days, three days, three days, when his Complaint says two days, when his deposition testimony is inconsistent, these are the problems that his testimony has.

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, your Honor, things do change as a lawsuit goes on. The questioning -- recollections change, recollections are refreshed. And Mr. Tapia, one of the things that he -- three days, three days, three days, except we only have included two weeks where he worked four days because he remembered that he worked Halloween and he worked --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Remember, too, that cuts a little both ways because by I think I'll say his current testimony, his employment ended, by his account, in January of 2017. This Complaint was filed in 2017. So one could argue that its accuracy is much more reliable than what he might be saying today in 2019 since it is much farther afield from when all of the events in question occurred. So whatever he's reporting to you in the summer or fall of 2017 is much more likely to be accurate than what he might remember now two years later.

Isn't that true?

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, I can't attribute any fault to Mr. Tapia, who I find to have been consistent and helpful ever since he came back to the fold. So I think that it's my fault if there are any factual inaccuracies in the Complaint. And you can move to conform the pleadings to the proof and I maybe should do that.

THE COURT: And you so move?

MS. CONNOLLY: And I so move.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. CONNOLLY: I hear you saying that the inference that you should draw -- maybe one should drawn from Soto's punch in/punch out on all of those days means that Mr. Tapia didn't, and that is just completely unfair in my view, because Mr. Soto testified -- there is no testimony that those punch-in and punch-out dates and times are accurate. In fact, the only

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

testimony we have as to the accuracy of the punch-in and punch-out times is that they are not accurate from the person who input, you know, his time into the POS system, and that's Mr. Soto.

THE COURT: And why should that testimony be accepted as credible? Why should I accept that his assessment is accurate? Because his time he would know even though we are talking about three years ago?

MR. CONNOLLY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: He could sit in a federal courtroom in May of 2019 and tell me that in October of 2016, on a particular date, an entry isn't accurate? That strains credulity, as a lawyer would say. The honest answer would be "I have no idea," not "It's wrong."

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, I don't think that that is fair to say, "a more honest answer," because Mr. -- we don't know exactly what his problem -- the inaccuracy was that he identified.

THE COURT: We know this is a witness who had a settlement with the defendants that isn't getting paid, so we know that he has an ax to grind against the defendants. why should he necessarily have testimony that should be fully accepted as truthful in that regard when he is simply saying "it's wrong" rather than saying "I don't remember"?

MS. CONNOLLY: Well, he wasn't asked "Is this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

correct, " "Is this correct" in specific detail.

THE COURT: Yes, he was, actually, as I recall. can go back and look at the transcript, but I think there were questions about the records and the hours, and he said they were wrong. He didn't equivocate.

MS. CONNOLLY: No, I understand that, but that's what I'm saying. He was not asked about each particular entry, but there were -- what I see in some of those records are punch in and punch out for 18 minutes. You know, there are some things that just look crazy.

THE COURT: There are a lot of questions that should have been asked at this trial by both sides that were not asked, and I only tried to ask questions of a clarifying nature. My job is not to advance either your claims or their defenses. My job was to make sure the record had enough clarity from my standpoint so I could at least understand it, and I'm frankly not sure it does have enough clarity to understand all of the points we're talking about. But, look, he said what he said. We'll have to live with what his testimony is.

MS. CONNOLLY: Your Honor, that's just my point, that the fact that these records -- we don't have any testimony about the underlying data, we only have Ms. Storino's testimony that --

THE COURT: I understand that. You don't need to

repeat that point. I get that point.

You want the data entry person here. Short of that, we have to question the records. That's your position.

Anything else?

MS. CONNOLLY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Avery, why does the Pretrial Order say July 1st? I meant to ask you that before.

MR. AVERY: Sure, your Honor.

Your Honor, to explain that, we would have to sort of go back and forth over the way that it was drafted. It was drafted initially proposing a broader July -- I forget what it was. January we took out the end date. There was a precise date in July, and then it was left as just in July 2016.

To be honest with you, not to -- to try to get some sense of the start time of his employment, not to play tricks with June 26th because it is only four days earlier, but because in his deposition he had said it was one year in the winter, and so when she said it was essentially July of 2016, we realized in July of 2016, in which case, to be honest with you, if we were to take that at its face, which she is suggesting is that he actually didn't work June 26, 2016, and I'm not even suggesting that's true. In fact, what I said here is we actually owe him for that money. I'm not saying he didn't work, and she's actually not suggesting that he didn't work on that day.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Why should -- to Ms. Connolly's point, why should the accuracy of the Soto or the Tapia labor reports not be questioned based on the record that exist in this case at trial?

MR. AVERY: Sure. So her -- I want to answer the question but I want to take the issue head on. Her position is essentially because Mr. Soto and Mr. Tapia were the people that entered their time, it is sufficient for them to overcome their burden to say it's not right, the record is wrong. Except that's not the law. That is actually not the law at all. fact what the law is -- and it is more true for Mr. Tapia because he was being called as a fact witness, but the law is that they have the burden initially, as your Honor suggested. Once we produced specific records, they have the burden of attacking the accuracy of those records by identifying specific dates and times that were omitted. Mr. Soto couldn't do that. In fact, that was outright asked of him by his own counsel in advance of my questioning, because she knew that's what was going to be asked, that he couldn't identify anything actually wrong with it specifically other than the fact that he just thought it was wrong.

He had an opportunity on both direct and cross to say what was wrong with the record, what specific date does he think was omitted. And in fact, the continued reference to the 18 minutes, what it omits is the fact that there is a huge

block of time on that same date, meaning he punched in and out for 18 minutes, and then like 20 minutes later punched in for nine hours. That's not that uncommon to just punch in early and then be like, never mind, I'm going to go get a cup of coffee or something. I mean, on its face it is not suspicious that somebody punched in twice in one day for two different times periods, especially when Mr. Soto claims — and this isn't — this isn't — to an extent actually it is, because of what he testified to, is that he had two different positions; one is a porter and one is this other sort of handyman position. And so I'm not sure what she's actually suggesting.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. AVERY: I just want to say one sentence.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. AVERY: If it is sufficient for an employee to simply say the records are inaccurate because I don't think they are accurate, then basically there would be no burden shifting at all in the FLSA context. That would mean they can just say the records are inaccurate because it serves their purpose.

That's it.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else, Ms. Connolly?

I was just trying to tie up the loose ends about the

July 1st date, and then we spilled out into something else. Is

there anything else you want to address?

MR. CONNOLLY: Nothing in closing, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let's take a recess and during

the recess why don't you all work with Mr. Tam to get the

confession of judgment reprinted out, the blank pages, so the defendants can sign them. And he is a notary and he can

6 notarize them, and then you will have originals and then that

7 | will resolve that issue.

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CONNOLLY: I would like to point out that there is an issue regarding the -- I will just have to pursue it later. The issue is, of course, the interest money but never mind.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know that there is anything that we can do about that issue at this moment. You have to do what you need to do with respect to the confessions of judgment, and then following that it seems to me you will deal with the interest issue. There is nothing we can do about that at this moment in time.

MS. CONNOLLY: Right.

THE COURT: Right?

MS. CONNOLLY: Right.

THE COURT: OK.

MS. CONNOLLY: Thank you, your Honor.

THE CLERK: All rise.

MR. AVERY: Your Honor, how long are we in recess?

THE COURT: I can't answer that question yet. What

I'm trying to decide is am I going to be able to render a

J5mdtap2

decision on the record right now, which I would like to do because it would be efficient, or whether I want to reserve decision and review the transcript and the submissions and do a written opinion, which is a lot more work and which will take a lot more time. So in the next I'll say 15 or 20 minutes I am going to make that decision and either come out and render a decision or come out and tell you that I am reserving decision, but I need to think about that a little bit more.

MR. AVERY: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: So I would say 15 to 20 minutes, probably.

(Recess)

(Continued on next page)

THE COURT: All right. Everyone may be seated.

I'm never going to be more familiar with this case than I am at this very moment in time. So, I think while it is somewhat challenging to do, I am going to make my best effort at rendering a decision at this time.

What I anticipate doing over the next few minutes is making my ruling, and then what we'll need to do is set a schedule for Ms. Connolly to make her motion with respect to attorney's fees in this case, which we've discussed previously we would hold until the end of the case, which we will be at this point. And then what I would say, based on my decision today, is that as part of that motion practice, if anybody wishes to make what I'll call effectively a motion for reconsideration of my ruling, that can be built into what we're going to brief to resolve the rest of the case, if anyone chooses to do that. But I think it will be more efficient to proceed that way than to proceed with further submissions and the like. You've all submitted already. This is a pretty straightforward case.

So, I am going to proceed with the findings and conclusions of law. So, I'm going to set forth on the record my conclusions of law and findings of fact under Rule 52(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Plaintiff Victor Tapia commenced this action on June 29, 2017. He seeks to recover monetary damages, including

unpaid minimum wages, unpaid spread-of-hours wages, liquidated damages, damages for statutory violations, interest and attorney's fees and costs for defendants' purported violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which I'll refer to as the "FLSA," New York Labor Law, which I'll refer to as "NYLL" or the "Labor Law," and the supporting New York State Department of Labor regulations.

There are five defendants in the action, three individuals -- Antonio Piacquadio, Carlo Seneca, Michael Geniton -- and two corporations -- Space New York 50th Street LLC, which I will refer to as "Space" or "Space New York," and Eden Ballroom LLC, or "Eden Ballroom."

The parties consented to my jurisdiction for all purposes in this case, including trial, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 636(c).

Under the FLSA and New York Labor Law, a plaintiff employee bears the burden of proof to establish all claims and damages by a preponderance of the evidence. However, where an employer's payroll records are inaccurate or incomplete, courts apply a burden-shifting scheme to determine whether an employee has established that he was underpaid and what damages he has suffered. Under this burden-shifting framework, an employee may meet his burden of proof by producing sufficient evidence from which violations of the federal and state labor laws and the amount of an award may be reasonably inferred, and this

burden may be met through estimates based on the employee's own recollections.

Let me pause to say that for a lot of the legal propositions that I'm setting forth on the record, there is case law in support of the various conclusions of law, but for purposes of time, I will not read into the record the case law citations. What I will do instead is issue a separate decision, or perhaps we can annotate the transcript with the case citations that support the various provisions of law that I am setting forth on the record.

In any event, to continue:

If the employee offers evidence from which violations may be inferred, the employer must then come forward with evidence of the precise amount of work performed or with evidence to negate the reasonableness of the inference to be drawn from the employee's evidence. If an employer fails to present such evidence, the Court may enter judgment in the employee's favor and determine damages even though the result may only be approximate.

With respect to witness credibility:

Although a plaintiff's testimony regarding his recollection alone may be sufficient to establish a rebuttable presumption that he worked certain hours for which he was not compensated, such testimony only establishes such a presumption if the testimony is credible. It is within the province of the

District Court, as the trier of fact, to decide whose testimony should be credited, and as trier of fact, the Judge is entitled, just as a jury would be, to believe some parts and disbelieve other parts of the testimony of any given witness.

In making findings of fact in a bench trial, a trial judge must assess witness credibility to determine what is believable and what is not. In doing so, the trial judge must evaluate a witness' demeanor.

With respect to the minimum wage claims:

The FLSA and New York Labor Law require an employer to pay not less than a statutorily set minimum wage for each hour of work. Under the FLSA, the applicable minimum wage since July of 2009 -- July 24th, precisely -- has been \$7.25 per hour. Under New York Labor Law, the applicable minimum wage between December 31, 2015, and December 30, 2016 was \$9 per hour. The applicable minimum wage after December 31, 2016 was \$11 per hour for large employers, 11 or more employees, and \$10.50 per hour for small employers, 10 or fewer employees. The federal minimum wage does not preempt the state minimum wage, and a plaintiff may recover under whatever statute provides the highest measure of damages.

With respect to tip credits:

An employer may pay tipped employees less than the normal minimum wage by crediting a portion of the tips received by the employee against the required minimum wage. To take

advantage of this tip credit, an employer must have informed an employee that his tips were being credited against his wages.

Under the FLSA, it is not required that the employer provide notice of the tip credit in writing. However, under New York Labor Law, notice of the tip credit must be in writing and in the employee's primary language. If the employer cannot show that it has informed employees that tips are being credited against their wages, then no tip credit can be taken and the employer is liable for the full minimum wage.

With respect to spread of hours, which is the second claim for relief. I should have said that the minimum wage claims were for the first and second claims for relief. But the spread of hours with respect to the New York Labor Law claim:

The spread-of-hours provision in the New York labor regulations requires an additional hour's pay at the basic minimum hourly rate for any day where the employee worked in excess of 10 hours, not where an employee worked exactly 10 hours. Employers are required to pay spread-of-hours wages for all employees in restaurants regardless of a given employee's regular rate of pay. The spread of hours is the length of the interval between the beginning and end of an employee's workday. The spread of hours for any day includes time off for meals as well as intervals during which the employee is off duty.

Failure to timely pay wages, which is the fifth claim for relief:

New York Labor Law Section 191 provides that a manual worker shall be paid weekly and not later than seven calendar days after the end of the week in which the wages are earned. Courts have held that employees have a private right of action under Section 191. Though the section itself does not have a damages provision, courts have found that employees can seek liquidated damages under Section 191 through the remedial provision of Section 198(1)-A.

With respect to the statutory violations claims, which is the sixth claim for relief.

As to wage notices:

New York Labor Law requires that an employer provide a wage notice to each employee within 10 business days of the employee's first day of employment. The wage notice must inform the employee of, among other things, the employee's regular hourly rate of pay and overtime rate, whether the employee will be paid by the hour, shift, day, week, etc., and any allowances to be taken by the employer. The wage notice must be given in writing in English and in the employee's primary language. An acknowledgment of receipt signed by the employee shall be kept on file for six years, and the employer has the burden of proving compliance with the notification provisions.

From February 27, 2015 onward, an employee could recover \$50 for each workday that the employer violated or continued to violate Section 195(1), up to a statutory maximum of \$5,000.

With respect to wage statements:

New York Labor Law requires that an employer furnish each employee with a wage statement with every payment of wages. The wage statements must inform the employee of, among other things, the employee's rate of pay, the employee's gross wages, and the employee's net wages. From February 27, 2015 onward, an employee could recover \$250 for each workday that the employer violated or continued to violate New York Labor Law Section 195(3), up to a statutory maximum of \$5,000.

With respect to liquidated damages generally:

Under the FLSA, a plaintiff is entitled to liquidated damages equal in amount to actual damages for violations of the FLSA's minimum wage and overtime provisions. Under New York Labor Law, like the FLSA, a plaintiff is entitled to liquidated damages for violation of the minimum wage and overtime provisions. On or after April 9, 2011, liquidated damages under the New York Labor Law are calculated at a hundred percent of the total unpaid wages. The Court has discretion to deny liquidated damages if the employer shows that despite its failure to pay appropriate wages, it acted in subjective good faith with objectively reasonable grounds for believing that

its acts or omissions did not violate the FLSA.

To establish the requisite subjective good faith, an employer must show that it took active steps to ascertain the dictates of the FLSA and then act to comply with them. An employer will not escape paying liquidated damages under the FLSA unless he establishes that he acted in good faith and in an objectively reasonable way by plain and substantial evidence. Courts have not substantively distinguished the FLSA standard from the current New York Labor Law standard of good faith.

A plaintiff may not recover cumulative liquidated damages under both the New York Labor Law and the FLSA because the liquidated damages provisions are identical in all material respects, serve the same functions, and address the same injuries.

A plaintiff may recover liquidated damages for wage claims but not for wage notice or statement claims brought under the New York Labor Law.

Courts also typically award prejudgment interest on damages for New York Labor Law violations. Prejudgment interest may be awarded in addition to liquidated damages under New York Labor Law. Prejudgment interest applies only to the actual compensatory damages and not to liquidated damages or to damages recovered due to violations of wage statement or wage notice provisions.

The New York statutory prejudgment interest rate is 9 percent.

3 4

times, interest may be computed from a single reasonable intermediate date between the dates that the plaintiff started

6

5

and stopped incurring damages.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

Attorney's fees and costs:

Under both the FLSA and New York Labor Law, a prevailing plaintiff may recover attorney's fees and costs.

With respect toe individual defendant's liability:

Where the plaintiff's damages were incurred at various

To establish a claim under the FLSA, a plaintiff must prove that a defendant is an employer within the meaning of the FLSA, that the plaintiff is an employee within the meaning of the FLSA, and that an employment relationship exists between The four factors to determine the economic reality of an employment relationship are whether the alleged employer had the power to hire and fire the employees, supervised and controlled employee work schedules or conditions of employment, determined the rate and method of payment, and maintained employment records. The definitions of the term "employer" under the FLSA and New York Labor Law are coextensive.

Having set forth all of those respective legal principles, some but not all of which may apply to the case before me, let me now reach the record before the Court.

The plaintiff's version of events, in a nutshell, is

that he worked roughly 28 weeks for these defendants, from July of 2016 to January of 2017. He claims he worked three days a week and 10 hours per day on occasion, and, according to Exhibit 1, I believe, it is two occasions he worked on four days.

The defendants' version, in a nutshell, is that the plaintiff only worked for three days -- June 26th, August 6th and August 12th of 2016 -- and that on one of those days, the June 26th date, he worked more than 10 hours, and on the other two dates he worked less than 10 hours, although more than nine hours on each of those two days.

Let me start with what I think I confirmed during the colloquy with counsel during the closing arguments. I think there is no dispute here that Mr. Tapia was not provided with a wage notice or with respect to a wage statement, so there is liability with respect to those statutory violations.

I also think I have confirmed with counsel, to the extent my statement of the law is correct, that other than on the June 26th date, there is no spread-of-hours claim here because, by plaintiff's own testimony and by the chart as reflected in Exhibit 1, he worked 10 hours but not more than 10 hours. I also believe that the plaintiff, who, as I said, has the initial burden here, has met that initial burden through his own testimony and through his recollections of the hours he says that he worked.

The defendant thereafter has proffered to the Court, and the Court has received in evidence, the labor reports that have been discussed at some length during the course of the trial both for Mr. Soto and for Mr. Tapia. And I conclude that those labor reports are acceptable and have not been discredited by the plaintiff.

I find that Ms. Storino's testimony, who was the person who generated and authenticated those business records, was credible. She is no longer an employee of these defendants. And she made clear that these reports were generated in the normal course. Nothing suggests that anything other than employees inputting their time of arrival and their departure created the data set for these reports. In other words, there is no evidence in the record to suggest, contrary to plaintiff's counsel's argument, that there was somehow some process beyond an employee arriving at the workplace, entering their employee identification number, and then doing the same upon departure that would have created the timeframe that was reflected in these labor reports.

So, while there was some discussion about perhaps there being some intermediary or some data entry person or someone else who could have accessed this, that strikes me on the record presented purely as speculative, and nothing was adduced from Ms. Storino, who would have been the witness to explain how the process worked beyond what I have suggested

based on the testimony or the logical inferences drawn therefrom, would suggest otherwise.

The mere fact that Mr. Soto and Mr. Tapia have reviewed the labor reports with respect to their respective hours and dispute them in and of itself doesn't discredit those reports. Indeed, Mr. Soto's labor reports cover, at least in part, some of the same days in which Mr. Tapia claims to have worked, and there is nothing in the record before the Court to explain or suggest why somehow those dates would have been reflected in Mr. Soto's reports but not in Mr. Tapia's.

There is no evidence before the Court that someone went in and altered these records, which effectively is the argument that plaintiff has to have made here. There is no evidence that these records were manipulated. And, so, the Court is left with the records as adequate for purposes of meeting the defendants' burden here to rebut the plaintiff's recollection as to the hours that he claimed that he worked.

Moreover, the Court is concerned with the accuracy of Mr. Tapia's testimony given that it was rife with inconsistencies. The Amended Complaint, which is effectively an admission in a case of this kind, reflected that the plaintiff worked two days a week and 13 hours a day. If the pleadings then conform to the proof, the proof did not reflect two days a week but three days a week, and less than the 13 hours that was pled. The plaintiff was impeached with his

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

deposition testimony at some length. The period of time that he testified that he worked at these defendants was articulated in a different timeframe during the deposition, both with respect to the dates and with respect to the hours, from his trial testimony that he gave here today. In addition, he said during his testimony today on direct that he didn't receive any check, and then on cross-examination he admitted that he did receive a check and it bounced.

So, while the Court is not suggesting that all of Mr. Tapia's testimony was not credible, there were enough inconsistencies in Mr. Tapia's testimony to render it ultimately unpersuasive to the Court in his obligation to meet the burden that ultimately remains with him under the New York Labor Law and under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I also find that the record does not support any individual liability as against the individually-named defendants in this case. The testimony from Mr. Tapia with respect to the individually-named defendants was minimal at best, and I cannot conclude, simply on the basis of the interaction that Mr. Tapia claimed that he had with respect to the payment of the \$1,020 and the so-called release that he signed that is in evidence, that that is sufficient to create an individual defendant's liability. And that was with respect to only one of the three individual defendants, and there was no other testimony with respect to the other individual

defendants. So I find that the factors that I previously identified were not sufficiently established by the plaintiff in order to create individual liability for any of the defendants in this case on the record before the Court.

So, all of that leads me to conclude here, with respect to the damages in this case, that they should be calculated as follows:

That with respect to the three dates that the records show Mr. Tapia has worked, the total number of hours would be 36 hours .32 and that that should be multiplied by the New York Labor Law minimum wage of \$9 per hour, as Mr. Tapia was not given any written notice in English and Spanish of any tip credit. So, that amount would be \$326.88. As I mentioned, there was a single day, the June 26th date, where he worked more than 10 hours, so that would be a spread-of-hours calculation of \$9 for that day. As I also said, there are statutory violations, and for the three days I find that it would be \$750 for the lack of the provision of a wage statement and \$150 for the lack of the provision of a wage notice.

The total amount of all of that adds up to \$1,235.88. I am not accounting for any payment of funds for any of the three dates, notwithstanding some of the testimony which was amorphous on that point with respect to the two August dates that the records show that he worked, one of which indicated that the defendants say a check was never cashed, and the

record is unclear as to the third payment. So, I am not discounting this number by those totals.

So, as I say, the total by the Court's calculation is \$1,235.88. Subtracting the \$1,020 that the plaintiff has admitted receiving, which would leave, other than attorney's fees, an amount of \$215.88 that is owed on the record presented to the Court today.

I just want to consult with my law clerks for a moment.

(Pause)

All right. I think I have covered all that I feel is necessary to cover today with respect to the respective claims.

I will add that while I think that there was some delay in the payment of the wages that were owed to Mr. Tapia based on the Court's calculation, the record was not developed in a way to suggest to me whether there should be some penalty with respect to that. If the parties and if the plaintiff wants to argue that there is, then the plaintiff can make some further submission in that regard.

I will also say that if the plaintiff wishes to make some sort of an argument with respect to liquidated damages,

I'll reserve on that point because I think the record is not entirely clear as to whether liquidated damages would be appropriate on the record based on the findings of the Court, but I am going to leave the question open should the parties

wish to pursue either of those particular points.

In any event, as I said at the outset, we're going to set a schedule because Mr. Soto's case was settled without there being any resolution of Ms. Connolly's fees with respect to that settlement and there is now a separate issue with respect to whether Ms. Connolly is entitled to fees with respect to Mr. Tapia's claim and, if so, how much, given that the claim was successful but not in the way that he had alleged. So that is where I stand in that regard. So we should set a schedule for the submission of motion papers at this time.

Ms. Connolly, how much time do you want to make your motion?

MS. CONNOLLY: 21 days.

Your Honor, I'm a little confused by your statement regarding liquidated damages because --

THE COURT: Let's come back to that. Let's just do the schedule and then we can come back to that.

So essentially three weeks from today. June 12th?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes.

THE COURT: That's three weeks from today. That's OK?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. June 12th.

How much time do you want to respond?

MR. AVERY: I would actually ask for three weeks as

well, because I am not sure how large the attorney's fee 1 2 application is going to be and if I have to go through all of 3 the line items. 4 THE COURT: OK. July 3rd, then, you want, right 5 before the holiday? 6 Yeah. Hopefully, I won't use it all. MR. AVERY: 7 How about I give you to June 28th? THE COURT: 8 MR. AVERY: OK. Thank you, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: I think that should be enough time. 10 Do you want a reply? 11 MS. CONNOLLY: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Given the holiday, how about the 12th of 13 July? 14 MS. CONNOLLY: Sure. 15 THE COURT: OK. Now, what were you going to say? MS. CONNOLLY: Regarding your statement regarding 16 17 liquidated damages, saying that the record wasn't clear as to whether or not they should be awarded, my understanding is that 18 they are mandatory if there are unpaid wages, and the Court's 19 20 finding is that there were unpaid wages. 21 THE COURT: Well, yes, that is true, but of the 22

\$1,235.88, 900 of those are statutory violations which are not eligible for liquidated damages. So we're talking about a very small amount of money here, right? So if you take that out of the 1,235, you are down to 335, effectively, right? So if you

23

24

want to argue for whatever that amount of money is, I'll let 1 you do that and they may not contest it. But I didn't 2 3 calculate that because I don't agree with you that it is 4 mandatory. That's not the law. It is not mandatory. So you 5 would have to argue why they are justified here, and it can't 6 be simply that they are defendants in two other lawsuits; 7 that's not a sufficient basis. You will have to argue something beyond that. But I'm just reserving that question to 8 9 enable you to make whatever arguments you want to make in that 10 regard. OK? 11 Is there anything else that anyone wishes to raise at 12 this time? 13 MR. AVERY: No, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Ms. Connolly? 15 MS. CONNOLLY: Not regarding Mr. Tapia, but I just want to point out to the Court that the Court did reserve 16 17 decision in the Soto matter in the stipulation of dismissal --18 MR. AVERY: Retained jurisdiction, you mean. 19 MS. CONNOLLY: Retained jurisdiction, yes. 20 THE COURT: In the stipulation of dismissal. 21 MS. CONNOLLY: In the stipulation of dismissal which 22 the Court so ordered. 23 THE COURT: OK. 24 MS. CONNOLLY: I don't have the ECF number right now.

THE COURT: That is fine. What does that mean for

purposes of what you are planning to do? I thought you have a confession of judgment which you are going to file, right?

MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, I am. I am just -- given the history and just I wanted the Court to be aware that it had retained jurisdiction, and we'll see what happens in --

THE COURT: OK. I mean, if there is some further enforcement application before this Court at some point down the road, you will obviously make it. If you have reserved that right, then that's more than fine.

As I say, if for some reason you want to make what I'll call some sort of a motion for reconsideration, or something like that, because you think —— I'm sure you think many of the rulings I made are wrong, but you have to have a basis for it to satisfy the reconsideration standard. And I thought it was most efficient to make a ruling today while the record was clear and fresh in my mind and I had prepared as much as I could depending on how the evidence was going to come out, so I think it is always in parties' interest to get a ruling sooner rather than later.

So, thank you all and have a good afternoon.

MS. CONNOLLY: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. AVERY: Thank you, your Honor.

THE CLERK: All rise.

(Adjourned)

1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION											
2	Examination of: Page											
3	SAUL SOTO											
4	Direct By Ms. Connolly 9											
5	Cross By Mr. Avery											
6	Redirect By Ms. Connolly											
7	Recross By Mr. Avery											
8	VICTOR TAPIA											
9	Direct By Ms. Connolly											
10	Cross By Mr. Avery											
11	Redirect By Ms. Connolly											
12	Recross By Mr. Avery											
13	Redirect By Ms. Connolly											
14	DEVLYN STORINO											
15	Direct By Mr. Avery											
16	Cross By Ms. Connolly											
17	Redirect By Mr. Avery											
18	PLAINTIFF EXHIBITS											
19	Exhibit No. Received											
20	1											
21	DEFENDANT EXHIBITS											
22	Exhibit No. Received											
23	D2											
24	A											
25	A1											

1	С	 	 	 	 12	5	
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							